The Solicitors' Journal.

LONDON, JUNE 20, 1863.

Mr. Justice Mellor has made the rule absolute for a mandamus to register Mr. Rudolph's transfer of shares in the so-called Inns of Court Hotel Company (Limited). He has thus succeeded, at the cost of £400, in getting rid of his liability on 400 shares in this company. He is probably not ill-advised in taking this step, although it involves so heavy a loss, and has exposed him to such serious opposition from the directors of the company. One might have supposed that they would have been well content with so handsome a contribution to their preliminary expenses, without seeking to impose a further mulct of another £400 upon a man whose only fault was too much reliance upon their own representations. If, indeed, Mr. Rudolph had been bold enough for the attempt of turning the tables upon his opponents, they would perhaps have been less anxious to have kept him on their books as a shareholder against his will, and have been glad to have let him go on easier terms. If he could have substantiated by such evidence as would satisfy a jury the charges which his counsel Mr. Hawkins made the other day in his speech before Mr. Justice Mellor, he might probably have succeeded, not only in getting rid of his future liability, but also in recovering back the money which he had already paid. The wonder is, therefore, how the directors of the company could have had the temerity to adopt such proceedings towards a recalcitrant shareholder as came to light on the recent hearing. Nothing else than a very desperate condition of the company's affairs could redeem the directors' conduct from the charge of being one of those blunders which are said to be worse than a crime. Viewed in any light, indeed, it is difficult to regard their conduct without condemnation. At the very time that Rudolph was endeavouring to effect the transfer of these 400 shares, namely the middle of April, the organ of the company was assuring its readers that more than half the capital had been subscribed, which was "ample for the purposes of the company," adding "that if any persons propose to take shares they must apply immediately, or the opportunity will be lost of procuring them otherwise than in the market, where, from the nature of the constituency, who are all *investors*, and not speculators, they are not likely to appear." On the 20th of April Rudolph executed the transfer, and on the following day he lodged it for registration. At that time he was the holder, no doubt, of considerably more than one-tenth of the entire number of issued shares, and it is not surprising therefore to find that the lodgment of his deed of transfer occasioned a speedy meeting of the board, or that the notice of the meeting should be—"to consider the desirability of allowing Mr. Rudolph to transfer his shares." It was no doubt a serious matter, and one requiring immediate attention. But considering the advertisements, prospectuses, and other official announcements which were then being put forth by the company—with frequent asseverations of the sanction and support of influential members of the legal profession—one might have expected a very different result from the deliberations of the directors. The mere fact that so large a shareholder was willing to forfeit not only the whole of the deposit, but the further call made on allotment, would have induced most boards of directors to have paused and asked themselves whether it was fair or honest still to persist in the endeavour to force such a scheme upon the public by the mere strength of prospectuses and advertisements? For five weeks afterwards, however, they go on advertising for new shareholders to pay or become liable for £10 a share, while they knew that Mr. Rudolph would have been very glad to have forfeited the deposit and allotment money upon 400 of the large number of shares held by him; and not only did they keep this secret from the public, but they also kept secret the fact that on the 23rd of April—the day of *the* board meeting—they had passed a resolution for the further call of £1 per share, which they had intended to be obligatory upon every new shareholder the moment he paid his deposit. This intention has been defeated by the decision of Mr. Justice Mellor, which is in accordance with every notion of common sense and fair-play. It would be a monstrous state of the law if shareholders in limited companies, could thus be tied up from transferring their shares by such artful devices of directors. It was perfectly allowable and fair in Mr. Rudolph to get rid of his *future* liability as towards the other shareholders by transferring his shares. He would be still exposed to secondary liability to creditors in case the company came to be wound up; so that creditors would suffer no injury by the transfer. The only damage would be to those who insisted in carrying on the concern, and they could hardly be heard to complain. In whatever light, therefore, we regard Mr. Justice Mellor's decision it appears to be right. Within a few days past, indeed, Vice-Chancellor Kindersley has decided, on the construction of 7 & 8 Vict. c. 110, s. 54, that where a shareholder transfers his shares after the call is made, but before the day fixed for payment, such transfer is valid. In *Reg.* v. *The Inns of Court Hotel Company Limited* there was merely a private resolution to make the call—passed unquestionably, with the direct object of preventing the particular transfer—kept secret from all the world, except the proposed transferror, and only communicated to him by a letter of the secretary; the communication and the resolution being both subsequent to the lodgment of the deed of transfer for registration. It has been reserved for the directors of the Lawyers' Hotel to raise this point of law—if the question between them and Mr. Rudolf may be dignified by such a description.

The Irish Master of the Rolls and Master Litton, one of the Irish Masters in Chancery, have lately had a public "assault of arms" of a character such as would rather surprise the weak nerves of our English public. There was recently an appeal to the Rolls from a decision of Master Litton, and although the Irish Master of the Rolls affirmed the decision of his subordinate, he made some observations on the manner in which the case had been handled in the Master's office, and also reflecting indirectly on the conduct of Mr. Macnamara, one of the solicitors engaged in the case. Upon this Mr. Macnamara addressed a complaint and remonstrance to the learned judge, whereupon he delivered what appears to have been treated as a revised judgment, omitting the allusions complained of by the solicitor, but still reflecting upon the judicial qualities of Master Litton. The next time the case (*Bradley* v. *Flood*) came before the Master, he availed himself of the opportunity of retorting upon his superior judge, in language that will be considered, on this side of the channel, as wholly inexcusable. We cull one or two specimens out of a very lengthened report which has appeared in one of the Dublin journals:—

As the Master of the Rolls had full power in right of his appellate jurisdiction to reverse, or alter, or add to these orders, and as he has not done so, I must conclude that he had arrived at the conclusion which I had arrived at when I signed them, and by which I altogether abide, that they are not susceptible of improvement, and that as applied to the matters in question they are perfect. And yet, strange to say, whilst he has arrived at this conclusion, nine-tenths of his judgment have been occupied in seeking to show their infirmities. I much fear if this case should go, as the Master of the Rolls considers it likely it will do, to the House of Lords, that the Law Lords will be a little puzzled what to make of this judgment. His judgment presents a most elaborate argument, having for its object to show that my orders are all wrong; but the same judgment it-

self pronounces them all right, and they are now not Master Litton's orders, but the Master of the Rolls' orders. To these very palpable contradictions, in his judgment, a very considerable misapprehension both as to the facts, and, as I think, as to the law, may have been contributory. . . . . As it appears likely that there may be extended litigation in this case, I have thought it my duty to state so far that the Master of the Rolls might be set right as to some matters which must have been imperfectly brought before him, and that he may feel assured that his order and my orders are right. I observe that at the end of his judgment the Master of the Rolls has advised that the parties should appeal from his own order. I fear that the Law Lords, if the case should go to the House of Lords, will say that it is a little peculiar. If his order, confirming mine, ought, in this view, to be appealed from, why not himself make such an order as he thinks the appellate jurisdiction ought to make, and let that be appealed from or not as the counsel for the parties shall advise. I cannot concur with the Master of the Rolls in advising a further appeal in this case, because I think that my orders, now confirmed by his order, are very good orders, and that any further appeal must be, as the present appeal has been, unsuccessful. If there is any doubt about the propriety of his order and of my orders (which are now identical) of course the parties may be advised to appeal, and as the appellate jurisdiction is now formed it is very certain that there, by the eminent judges who now constitute that tribunal, the appeal will be heard, as every case ought to be heard, with dignity, with patience, and with temper.

Independently of the unseemliness of such a retort from a subordinate judge, about which there can be no second opinion, we are unable, with our present scanty materials, to come to any conclusion upon the merits of this judicial quarrel.

Mr. Serjeant Burke in the recent paper which he read before the Law Amendment Society, on the Law of Copyright in Literature and the Fine Arts after sketching its history and present state, makes the following proposal for its amendment:—

1st. One term of copyright to be established in all works of literature, the drama, music, and the fine arts.

2nd. One mode of registration for all kinds of copyright, and no copyright to accrue until registration. Some visible mark, such as the word "registered," with the date of registration, to appear prominently on all articles enjoying copyright. This may seem difficult in the case of unpublished dramas or musical compositions, but the word "registered" and date might appear on the bills announcing their performance.

3rd. A literary author to have such copyright in his work that it shall not be dramatised without his consent during the existence of his copyright. And as to foreign copyright, no foreign play, of a country in convention with us, to be dramatised or adapted here without the author's consent, while his copyright exists.

4th. No person but a native or naturalised subject of the British Empire to have copyright in it, except under an international copyright convention.

5th. An assessor of legal standing and experience to be appointed at Stationers' Hall, with discretionary and judicial powers as to registration, and the decision of ordinary matters connected with copyright law. There might, in graver questions, be an appeal from him to a superior court.

6th. A summary jurisdiction in all minor copyright matters, and particularly in cases of piracy. Such jurisdiction might be given to the assessor at Stationers' Hall in London, and to the judges of the county courts, and in mere piracy and the seizure of pirated copies, to two justices, or one stipendiary magistrate in the country.

7th. A power (under an order from the assessor or the justices) of immediate seizure of printed articles in glaring cases of piracy.

8th. Fine and penal imprisonment in such glaring cases.

9th. A brief summary of the copyright law, together with the rules and regulations to be published by the assessor, to be delivered at Stationers' Hall to any party applying, on payment of a small fee.

The Law Amendment Society will hold its next meeting on Monday, June 22, at Eight o'clock, when Mr. Robert Stuart will read a paper on "The Trial of Issues, involving the Consideration of Scientific Evidence and the Evidence of Experts." Lord Brougham will preside.

The Metropolitan and Provincial Law Association has presented a petition to the House of Commons on the subject of the two bills now before the House, intituled respectively, "A bill to make better provision for the enforcement throughout England and Ireland of the decrees and orders of the Courts of Chancery, Probate, and Divorce;" and "A bill to amend the law relating to the giving of security for costs by plaintiffs residing out of the jurisdiction of the courts," and thereinafter respectively referred to as "the Execution of Decrees Bill," and "the Costs Security Bill."

The petition states:—

That it is the opinion of your petitioners that the changes in the law proposed to be effected by these two bills would be productive of much public benefit, but that such benefit might be greatly increased, and the necessity for "the Costs Security Bill," as a separate measure, obviated, if the provisions of "the Execution of Decrees Bill," were extended so as to include Scotland as well as England and Ireland, and so as to make the judgments, orders, interlocutors, and decrees of any court of common law of any one of the three divisions of the United Kingdom immediately enforceable in the courts of the other two respectively.

That the provisions of the Companies Act, 1862, 25 & 26 Vict. c. 89, s. 122 (now representing the somewhat similar enactments contained in the 11 & 12 Vict. c. 45, ss. 115 and 116), making all orders for or in the course of the winding-up of a joint-stock company thus enforceable is constantly acted upon both as to Scotland and Ireland without any difficulty, and is found to work well, and is productive of great saving of expense in enforcing orders for payment of calls and the like; and that there appears to be no satisfactory reason why the great advantage of making common law judgments and orders enforceable in the same way should not be afforded.

The effect of this would be to make it unnecessary to stay until security for the defendant's costs be given the proceeding of plaintiffs resident in England, Ireland, or Scotland, but suing in a division of the United Kingdom other than that in which they reside, as the ground for ordering such security is that the defendant, in consequence of the plaintiff's being beyond the reach of the process of the court, may not be able to enforce the payment of any costs which may be awarded against the plaintiff; the reason for which practice in such cases will, of course, cease if the decisions of the Courts in each division of the United Kingdom be made enforceable in the others.

That the present practice of in all cases allowing defendants to stay the proceedings of every plaintiff who is not resident within the jurisdiction of the court until he gives security for the defendant's costs, is productive of much inconvenience and injustice, it being a constant practice for defendants to require such security in actions to which there is no defence, for the mere sake of delaying or avoiding the payment of just debts.

The defendant ought not to be entitled to require the plaintiff to give him security for costs, unless he has a substantive defence which may occasion him to incur costs.

The abuse of this practice would be avoided if, in all cases where a defendant makes application to stay proceedings in any action or suit until security for costs be given, on the ground that the plaintiff is resident out of the jurisdiction of the Court, such defendant were required to make oath to the effect that he has a good defence to such action or suit upon the merits, and does not make the application for the purpose of delay.

The petition prays that the said Execution of Decrees Bill may be amended, and clauses added to provide for the following objects:—

That the orders, interlocutors, and decrees of the Court of Session in Scotland may be enforced throughout England and Ireland.

That the decisions of any Court having any common law jurisdiction in any one of the three divisions of the United Kingdom may be enforced by any Court of either of the other two of such divisions respectively which would have had jurisdiction in respect of the cause of action if the defendant had resided in that part of that division of the United Kingdom where such decision is required to be enforced.

That no security for the defendant's costs in any proceeding, either at law or in equity, shall be required from any plaintiff

suing in one of such divisions on the ground only that he resides in another of such divisions.

That no security for the defendant's costs shall be required from any plaintiff in any case, unless the defendant makes oath that he has been advised, and believes, that he has a good defence on the merits, and that the application for such security is not made for the purpose of delay.

And that the said Execution of Decrees Bill, so amended and added to, may pass and become law, &c.

The petition is signed by William Shaen, the chairman of the Association; Edward F. Burton, the deputy-chairman of the Association, and Philip Rickman, the secretary of the Association.

THE HIGHWAY ACT of last session has been adopted in some portions of three-fourths of the counties of England, and 211 highway districts have already been formed under the Act.

THE ATTORNEYS TAX.

The Scotch Solicitors are co-operating with their English and Irish brethren in their attempt to get rid of the annual certificate duty. Mr. Kinnaird, on Monday evening last, presented to the House of Commons a petition from the solicitors of the city and county of Perth. Sir Hugh Cairns a few day previously presented two petitions from the Irish solicitors, one of which comprised the signatures of 150 firms and individuals. Mr. Malins has also presented the petition from the English members of the profession, including 232 names, of which our readers have been already informed; and other petitions from various parts of the three kingdoms are now following this lead. Enough has been already done to prepare the ground for next session, which is all that has been aimed at in these petitions, or that could be expected in so short a time. Not the least benefit arising from the movement is the evidence which it affords that the tax is felt throughout the three kingdoms to be a real grievance, and also to be one that may be got rid of by proper action. Ever since the partially successful effort of ten years ago, there appears to have grown up a notion in the profession that any further remission was hopeless, and that a considerable number of the more respectable, or rather more prosperous, attorneys were in favour of some annual duty, as a kind of barrier against pauper practitioners. The wide response which our appeal has met throughout the United Kingdom from attorneys of well established and high position in their various localities, is a conclusive answer to both these objections, especially when coupled with the negative evidence which is furnished by the fact that not a single letter has appeared supporting the opposite view. We are satisfied that the inaction of the last ten years is not attributable to this cause, but rather to the mistaken notion that the reduction then made was regarded by the Government as a long postponement, if not a settlement, of the entire question. There is no real foundation for such a notion Mr. Gladstone's measure for reducing the annual certificate duty and the duty on articles, was a sudden stroke of policy on the part of the Government, and was not accepted by the advocates of the total repeal of the annual duty as a satisfactory settlement of the question. The reduction on articles of clerkship was wholly unsolicited by the profession, and, we believe, was never suggested by the Council of the Incorporated Law Society, who managed the former movement. It has been generally since regarded as a step in the wrong direction, and it certainly affords no compensation to the general body of the profession for the continuance of the annual duty. If the Chancellor of the Exchequer must somehow or other recoup the public treasury, at all events partially, from within the same limited area of taxation, for the loss which the total repeal of the certificate duty would involve, the profession will not object to an increase of the stamp on the articles of clerkship, and still less to an increase on admission into its ranks. But the annual tax is so unfair in itself, and so burdensome in its incidence, that the attorneys are entitled to its repeal unconditionally, as a mere matter of justice, independently of any question as to the manner in which the deficit may be made good.

The petition of the procurators and solicitors of the city and county of Perth contains such an able summary of the arguments in favour of the total repeal of the annual duty, that we are induced to give it in full. It is as follows:—

That the certificate duty on attorneys, and a tax on warrants to prosecute, were first imposed in the year 1785, to make up an unexpected deficiency. The warrant stamp, and all other stamps on law proceedings, were afterwards abolished, as taxes on the administration of justice, but the certificate duty remains, and has been largely increased. At first, if a practitioner resided in London, he paid £5, and if in any other part of Great Britain, £3; but it is now £9 for those resident in London, Edinburgh, or Dublin, and £6 for those resident elsewhere.

The members of the legal profession also pay large sums to Government on articles of clerkship, and on their admission as attorneys, solicitors, or procurators.

These duties are partial, unequal, and unjust, for no other profession than that of attorneys, solicitors, and proctors is charged with similar stamp duties, nor is any annual stamp duty imposed on the higher branch of the legal profession The inequality of the tax is further proved by the circumstance that an attorney whose professional emoluments amount only to £100 per annum is charged the same tax as one whose emoluments amount to £1,000 a year.

Such duties, besides, are not founded on any just principle of taxation.

If a tax on the talent and industry of individuals engaged in a lawful calling be at all expedient, it ought to be levied, not only on the three learned professions but on all merchants, bankers, manufacturers, traders, and others. A small tax on each would remove the grievances complained of, and, at the same time, produce far more than the amount now levied unjustly on attorneys and solicitors.

It is now an established principle that there should be no class legislation—that taxes should be general, and not be imposed for the protection of manufacturing, agricultural, or any other class. If, therefore, it be wrong to levy imposts on the community for the benefit of a class, it must be equally wrong to impose burdens on one class in exoneration of the rest.

The attorneys and solicitors, in common with their fellow subjects, pay, at least, their equal share of all the taxes imposed on the community at large. The certificate duty, which falls exclusively on their branch of the profession, is, in fact, an additional income tax; and as they are required to pay income tax on their professional earnings, they ought, in fairness and justice, to be relieved from the certificate duty; otherwise they are subjected to a burden double the amount borne by the other classes of the public.

By the operation of many recent changes in the law and practice of the courts, and by enactments relating to deeds and other documents, the emoluments of the profession have been much diminished—although the disbursements continue very nearly the same. This is submitted to the consideration of the Legislature, as another reason, if another were required, why this tax should be repealed.

The petitioners do, therefore, humbly pray that it may please your Honourable House to pass an Act repealing the annual certificate duty, payable by attorneys, solicitors, proctors, notaries public, and other members of the legal profession.

We have been favoured with a copy of this petition by Mr. Maury, the secretary of the "procurators and solicitors in the city and county of Perth, incorporated by royal charter." We need hardly say that we shall be happy to place on record all the petitions to Parliament on this important subject, and for this purpose desire to receive copies from the secretaries of local law societies, and others who take an interest in the movement.

The Metropolitan and Provincial Law Association also presented a petition to the same effect, on Thursday evening, through Mr. Murray. It will serve as a model for petitions in the country, and with this view we give it at length. It is as follows:—

That the Metropolitan and Provincial Law Association is a

society composed of nearly 800 attorneys and solicitors practising in England and Wales, of whom the greater part carry on business in the provinces, and that its objects are to promote the better and more economical administration of the law, and to maintain the rights and increase the usefulness of the profession.

That in the year 1785, in consequence of an anticipated deficiency in the shop tax, which was a war tax, a duty was imposed upon the annual certificates of attorneys, solicitors, and proctors, together with a tax on warrants to prosecute.

That such shop tax has long since been repealed.

That the tax on warrants to prosecute, together with all other taxes on law proceedings, were in the year 1824 declared to be inexpedient as taxes on the administration of justice, and were accordingly abolished.

That, nevertheless, the annual certificate duty has been not only not repealed, but was from time to time prior to the year 1853 increased from its original amount of £5 on metropolitan and £3 on provincial certificates, to £12 on metropolitan and £8 on provincial certificates, granted to persons who had been admitted more than three years, half those sums being charged during the first three years from admission. That in the year 1853 this annual duty was reduced to its present limits of £9 on Metropolitan and £6 on Provincial certificates, with the like reduction of one-half in favour of practitioners not admitted more than three years.

That your Honourable House has of late years acted on the now established principle that all taxes should be imposed fairly and generally, and not for the protection of any particular class or interest, and that it is evidently unjust that a tax should be imposed upon one particular class in exoneration of any other class.

That while the branch of the legal profession to which your petitioners belong is not, and justly is not, exempted from any taxes which are imposed upon the other classes of their fellow-citizens, it affords the only case in which British subjects following a lawful and honourable calling are prevented by law from each placing their own value upon the exertion of their respective individual talents and industry, and are restricted to a scale of charges that does not vary with the gradually increasing expenses of living arising from the continual diminution in the relative value of money.

That the amount of revenue derived from this duty is comparatively insignificant, while the tax presses heavily and unequally upon solicitors having but small practice.

That the effect of various enactments which have been passed of late years for the amendment and alteration of the law, as well as for regulating the practice of the courts, has been considerably to diminish the emoluments of attorneys and solicitors, and at the same time to render the disbursements necessary for the prosecution of the business of their clients more onerous.

That the certificate duty from which the other branch of the legal profession is exempt is equivalent to a tax of £3 per cent. upon the average incomes of attorneys and solicitors. The effect of it is therefore that they are compelled to pay an income tax of six pounds per cent. while the rest of their fellow-subjects pay three pounds per cent. only.

As an evidence of the severe pressure of the annual certificate duty at the present time your petitioners crave leave to draw the attention of your Honourable House to the fact that a large number of attorneys and solicitors are every year excluded from the *Law List*, in consequence of their certificate duty not having been paid within the time fixed by the Act.

Your petitioners submit that according to every principle of fairness and justice in taxation, if it can be deemed expedient to impose any especial tax on the talent and energy of persons engaged in lawful and honourable business, such tax ought to be raised by an equal assessment upon every branch of industry.

That as the protest which your petitioners feel bound to make against this tax is founded upon the fact that it is partial and unjust in its nature much more than upon its actual amount, your petitioners cannot regard the remission of a portion thereof which was made in 1853 as any settlement of the question; but, on the contrary, they consider such remission as only a small instalment of justice, and an acknowledgment that the tax is in itself indefensible.

Your petitioners therefore humbly pray that your Honourable House will be pleased to take this subject into consideration, and that the annual duty on the certificates of attorneys, solicitors, and proctors may be wholly repealed, &c.

WILLIAM SHAEN, Chairman.
PHILIP RICKMAN, Secretary.

We hope that the Metropolitan and Provincial Association will urge upon those of its numerous country members, who have not already signed the petition which was forwarded through the agency of this journal, to present petitions to the House of Commons from their various localities. A few more local petitions before the close of the session may do good service by keeping the question alive in Parliament. We feel confident that if the attorneys and solicitors of the United Kingdom only pull together with a little energy, they will gain their object without much delay. It will be necessary, however, that the movement should have not only the sanction, but the direction and aid of the incorporated societies of the three kingdoms. The councils of these various bodies must now be aware of the strong and general feeling which exists amongst their constituencies in favour of the immediate and total repeal of this burdensome and exceptional annual tax.

THE RECENT "FINAL" EXAMINATION.

Last week we remarked on the number of candidates who presented themselves at the final examination in the term which has just expired; and in pursuance of the promise we then gave, we proceed to make some general comments on that examination.

Without having recourse to under-hand modes of procedure, we have been favoured with an inspection of the questions that were proposed to the candidates; and we must say that we think they reflect great credit on the examiners. The conveyancing questions were no doubt a little difficult, and one, at least, was unintelligibly obscure; but on the whole they were fair questions, and calculated to give students an opportunity of displaying their ability if they had any. The questions in the other branches call for no particular remark. If anything, they were a trifle too easy; and probably it may be owing to this that no more than sixteen were "plucked" out of so large a number of candidates as 147. From mixing freely with the candidates and hearing their opinions and mutual consolations as they stood in the building before and after their two days' examination, we were led to expect that more would have been rejected than have been. But then we remember the students' sheet anchor. This was, *par excellence*—Master Brewer. Of course we are merely relating what we heard from the students themselves,—but ever and anon from the buzz of conversation among the examinants, there arose the words, "Master Brewer." We were curious to learn what the frequent repetition of this gentleman's name meant, and were informed that he, with his benign countenance and kindly heart, rather than their own knowledge, was the source to which many students looked for a safe deliverance.

But we think our young friends deceived themselves in this. No one can know Master Brewer without acknowledging his many excellent qualities, but it would be a false kindness, and one to which he would not stoop, to let loose on the public ignorant practitioners. Better for hopes to be blighted than that wrong should be done. The fluctuations, sometimes very extraordinary, that occur in the number of rejected candidates at the different terms, lead many to infer that the caprice of the individual examiners is the cause of the variance, and then folks look at the physiognomy of the examiners, and, by the rules of Lavater, determine who is lenient and who is strict. But this is quite a mistake. We have no doubt but that each one of the examiners does his duty without favour or affection, and that the fluctuations in the number of the rejected are occasioned by subtle causes, which bring sometimes a greater or sometimes a lesser number of incapable examinants. We therefore advise those who are now preparing for examination not to rely on the leniency of this or that particular examiner, or to be afraid of the strictness of another, but honestly and industriously to go on with

their studies, in the full assurance that persevering industry must attain success.

One noticeable feature of the last examination is that there are few, if any, complaints as to the character of the questions proposed. Few, perhaps, can understand the difficulty of proposing fair test questions. To grumblers we say—try your own hand at proposing to a student fifteen questions which shall give him a chance of exhibiting a fair knowledge of (say) common law. The difficulty would then at once be felt. The present system frequently gives the go-by to the knowledge which is possessed by comparatively well-informed students. And then they complain. Some say—why should country clerks have to answer chancery practice questions? Others say—why should London clerks, in exclusively conveyancing offices, have to answer questions in common law and the practice of what is familiarly known as "the bear-garden"? All exclaim that they ought to know before-hand the books in which they are going to be examined. But really we fancy these objections are unfounded. Country lawyers have occasionally to do with chancery, and doubtless many a hapless client has been urged into expensive error in consequence of his country adviser not having a slight acquaintance with the practice of the court in London. So, too, the tendency of London business is so effectual to erect specialities, that unless the articled clerk be made to learn something of each important branch of jurisprudence, he will never know anything about it; and in after life matters will arise in practice which will branch out beyond his speciality, and then he would be entirely lost but for the general knowledge which he will have acquired during his articles. And we suggest that there are most serious objections against the examiners notifying the books in which they will examine the students. The present system is already too often satisfied by a mere superficial cramming. To narrow the subjects of study by publishing them, would be merely to ease the "coaches," and to indulge the indolence of those who use them. Fifteen questions in each branch are but a slight test at best; and we venture to think that the instance is very rare indeed in which injustice is done by the present system. Indeed, we rather incline to think that students get through a little too easily; and certainly we think that the preliminary announcement of the subjects would have to be coupled with a further regulation extending the examination to five days, giving a day to each branch. We leave it to our readers to furnish their own commentary on the practicability of such a regulation; and meanwhile we have to record our satisfaction that the recent examination has not been productive of the usual amount of complaint on the score we have just alluded to.

But we think we are in duty bound to call the serious attention of the Incorporated Law Society to the delay in giving the result of the last preliminary examination. Candidates, of course, are unduly impatient; but there seems to us no reason why the preliminary examination cannot be as speedy as that prior to admission. Surely the last is the most important of all the examinations; and though there were so large a number at the last final examination, yet many of the candidates knew their fate in two days, and we believe that nearly, if not quite, all were informed in three days after the examination was concluded. Now, why cannot similar expedition be used in the preliminary examinations? The final examiners are practical men, pressed with the duties of their own business; and, moreover, they do their work for nothing, except the pleasure they feel in advancing the interest of the profession. The preliminary examiners are not so pressed, and they receive very ample salaries. Surely, then, they ought to excel in speed, and, at any rate, they ought not to take upwards of three weeks in performing work less onerous than that which busy men of business do for nothing in three days. We are far from blaming the Incorporated Law Society for this. We believe the delay we refer to has given to the Council of the society almost as much pain as to our correspondents who complain. But it will be the duty of the society to prevent the recurrence of such a delay, and to point out to the scholastic examiners how their conduct suffers in the comparison we have instituted.

And now we have one further remark to make in conclusion. This relates to the publication of the final questions. There is an order prohibiting this, and yet it continues to be done. The way this is accomplished is not very creditable to the profession. We have refrained from giving the questions thus surreptitiously obtained any extended publicity. But it is time that the Incorporated Law Society took some action in the matter. The Council of that body ought to see the folly of issuing orders which are set at naught with impunity. We suggest to the Council that they should make their questions copyright, and thus protect them from being published without authority; but, failing this or some other remedy, it is plain that mere even-handed justice requires the abrogation of an order which cannot be carried into effect.

THE PROPOSED LAW COLLEGE.

Mr. John Turner, of Carey-street, Lincoln's-inn, has given notice to the Council of the Incorporated Law Society, as a member of that body, of his intention to move, at the annual meeting, to be held on the 30th day of June instant, the following resolution:—

That application be made to her Majesty for the grant of a charter of incorporation for establishing a royal college of attorneys, solicitors, and proctors of Great Britain, and that it be referred to the Council of the Society to take the necessary steps for obtaining such charter; and that, if necessary for such purpose, the existing charter of the Society may be surrendered."

We believe that Mr. Turner is prepared to submit to the meeting a well-considered plan, which has for its object the transformation of the present Incorporated Society into a body resembling in its organisation and functions, and also in its professional relations, the College of Surgeons. One effect of such a change would probably be a very large increase in the number of provincial members, and consequently in their influence in the deliberations of the Council. No doubt a great number of persons who do not now belong to the Incorporated Law Society would be glad to be members of a professional College, which after a while would be made to include the entire body of new practitioners; nor is there any reason why the "Fellowship" of the College should not be as much sought after among lawyers as the same grade is among surgeons and physicians. We have no desire, however, to anticipate Mr. Turner's scheme, and now touch upon the topic only for the purpose of informing our readers, more definitely than the notice does, what the proposal is which they may expect.

It is beyond all question that the present organisation of the Incorporated Law Society does not meet the views and wishes of the great majority of the attorneys and solicitors in the country, and the consequences are such as might be expected. There is a sad want of professional union and co-operation in all matters relating to the interests of lawyers, and there is a growing feeling that the provincial solicitors are not properly represented, and therefore have not the weight to which they are entitled in the Metropolitan Council. They also feel that the present constitution of the society affords them but few and trifling personal inducements to join it. There is no particular credit or honour in the estimation either of their brethren or of the public to be obtained by becoming members of it. It is no wonder, therefore, that so large a proportion of country solicitors should have remained unconnected with the society, and it is equally clear that it is very undesirable to allow the profession

to continue in its present condition of disunion. We are satisfied that such a proposal as we understand Mr. Turner's to be is about the best remedy that can be suggested. It would unquestionably widen the basis of the existing Society, and both extend its functions and elevate its character. The plan suggested has, moreover, the advantage of being already tried, and found successful amongst another professional body, whose circumstances and position in the country, and relations to a cognate class of practitioners, are very analagous to those of attorneys and solicitors. Beyond all question the surgeons as a body have greatly improved their social and professional status since they have obtained, and through the agency of, their chartered college; and its beneficial effect upon the world outside has not been less than what it has produced within the ranks of the profession itself. It has certainly been a powerful and effective agent in raising the standard of education amongst the members, and of ambition amongst the fellows of that body. We can see no reason why the College of Attorneys should not be equally successful, or why they should not obtain a like charter of incorporation, conferring upon them, as a constituted body, privileges and functions similar to those which the Crown, many years ago, attributed to their medical brethren.

We have no doubt that Mr. Turner's proposal will receive at the approaching meeting a careful consideration and full discussion, which it deserves, and that the Council of the Incorporated Law Society will faithfully give effect, so far as it can do so, to any resolution which may be passed on the subject. It is obvious, however, that any step of the kind ought not to be taken at the suggestion of a few individuals, or of the majority of a small meeting; and therefore it is highly desirable that there should be a full attendance at the approaching annual meeting, when Mr. Turner's resolution will come on for discussion.

EQUITY.

FRAUD—LAPSE OF TIME.—The Court will not entertain a suit against the representatives of a deceased person thirty-eight years after his death, and fifty years after a fraud has been committed by him, to recover damages only, in respect of the profits accruing to him by his fraud, when the property so obtained fraudulently is irrecoverable. After such a lapse of time the Court will require a very specific case of fraud to be raised by the bill.

One agent of a company assisting in the fraud of another agent is not, *quoad* the shareholders, in the position of a trustee who knowingly permits another trustee to make wilful default.—*Walsham* v. *Stainton*, V. C. W., 11 W. R. 771.

Practice.

ADMINISTRATOR AD LITEM—15 & 16 VICT. C. 86, S. 44.—Where a defendant, who was a necessary party to a suit, in respect of a possible share in the income of the property sought to be made the subject of judicial decision, had disappeared many years ago in Australia, the Court, on an application by the plaintiff *ex parte*, allowed a representative *ad litem* to be appointed to protect his interest.—*Mortimer* v. *Mortimer*, M. R., 11 W. R. 740.

COMMON LAW.

QUO WARRANTO—PUBLIC OFFICE.—An information in the nature of a *quo warranto* will not lie for usurping an office which is not of a public nature, although such office may have been created by charter of the Crown.—*Ex parte Smyth*, Q. B, 11 W. R. 754.

RAILWAY COMPANY—LIABILITY FOR ACCIDENTS CAUSED BY WANT OF CARE.—Where, in starting a train from a station, the engine-driver blew off steam at a level crossing, and, in consequence of the noise so caused, a pair of horses, which were standing on the public road close by, and waiting to cross the line, became unmanageable, and ran against a wall—

Held, that there was want of care on the part of the servant, and that the company was liable for the damage thus occasioned to the horses and carriage.—*Manch. S. J. and A. R. Co., App.*, v. *Fullarton, Resp.*, C. P., 11 W. R. 754.

Practice.

CHANGE OF ATTORNEY—It is the invariable practice of the Court not to allow the attorney on the record to be changed unless the costs of the first attorney have been paid, and the fact that such attorney has other sufficient security for his costs is no reason for departing from that rule.—*Witt* v. *Ames*, Q. B., 11 W. R. 751.

BAIL COURT.

(Sittings in Banco, before Mr. Justice MELLOR.)

June 11.—*The Queen* v. *The Inns of Court Hotel Company.*—Mr. *Bovill, Q.C.*, and Mr. *A. S. Hill*, showed cause against a rule for a mandamus to compel the defendants to register the transfer of 400 shares. A gentleman named Rudolph applied for 500 shares in the above company, which were allotted to him. The deposit was £1 per share, and Mr. Rudolph had paid 10s. per share, leaving a balance of 10s. per share due on them. On the 21st of April Mr. Rudolph left with the company a transfer of the shares to Miss Lavinia Caroline Van Hoff, the balance being still owing, upon which the company, on the 24rd of April, made a call of £1 per share, payable on the 1st of September, thereby making him 30s. per share in arrears. On the 6th of May he paid the 10s. balance on the deposit, and demanded to have the transfer registered, but they still refused to do so on the ground that Mr. Rudolph was still a debtor to the company on account of the call. By the Companies Act, 1862, the directors were empowered to refuse to register where the party was in debt to the company. It was alleged that the call was made to prevent Mr. Rudolph from getting rid of his liability, and the directors contended that so long as any portion of that call remained unpaid they had a right to refuse to register the transfer.

Mr. *Hawkins, Q.C.* (with whom was Mr. *Henry James*), supported the rule. He said that Mr. Rudolph applied for 500 shares believing that fifty only would be allotted to him; but, instead of that, he was saddled with the whole, and he had paid £500 on them, and there was still a desire not to release him until the directors had obtained the whole of the £100,000, the proposed capital of the company; and if the directors were right in their views that they might make calls as often as they liked to keep him, they undoubtedly would not release him. Mr. Rudolph was anxious to get rid of his liability in this company; and the making of this call was no other than a fraudulent device; the money was not required, for the directors had only entered into the expenses of the solicitors in getting up the company and the payment of the directors to manage the affairs, when, in fact, there were none to manage. It showed, the learned counsel observed, what artful tricks could be concocted by a number of lawyers who, with unlimited assurance, got up a company limited. No notice of the call had been given; and with regard to the prospectus, it contained much that was not binding in law, common sense, or common honesty.

Mr. Justice MELLOR said he thought the want of notice a formidable objection.

Mr. *Hill* said that although they could not take measures for its recovery until notice of the call was given it was still a debt owing.

The learned Judge took time to consider his judgment.

June 12.— Mr. Justice MELLOR this morning delivered judgment. His Lordship said that he was of opinion the shareholder was not liable to the call until after notice specifying the time and place of payment, and that the defendants were not justified in refusing to register the transfer. The call made in April, when the exigencies of the company did not require it, did not make Mr. Rudolph indebted to them; and if the powers claimed by the defendants existed no transfer of shares could take place. The judgment of the Court was that the transfer of the shares in question should date from the time when Mr. Rudolph paid the 10s. balance on the £1 deposit.

Rule absolute accordingly.

MAGISTRATES' LAW.

HABEAS CORPUS—WARRANT OF JUSTICES—WANT OF SEAL.—A rule *nisi* having been obtained, calling on the governor of a house of correction to show cause why a writ of *habeas corpus* should not issue to bring up a prisoner in his custody, on the ground that the warrant under which he was committed was not properly sealed, a second warrant was lodged with the governor, similar in its terms to the first, and purporting to be signed by justices of the same name, but duly sealed.—Held, first, that if it were material the Court would assume from the facts stated above that the second warrant was substituted by the same justices as an amendment of the first; secondly, that the second warrant, though made after the rule had been obtained, was a sufficient warrant to the governor for the detention of the prisoner, and was an answer to the rule.—*In re William Phipps*, Q. B., 11 W. R. 730.

EVIDENCE — ADMISSIBILITY — AFFILIATION ORDER.—At the hearing of an affiliation summons the complainant was asked on cross-examination whether she had not had connection with one G. T., which she denied. Evidence was then tendered on behalf of the defendant to contradict her answers on cross-examination, and to prove that she had had connection with G. T., at such a period that he might have been the father of the child who was the subof the summons.

Held that the evidence was admissible.—*Garbutt, App.*, v. *Simpson, Resp.*, Q. B., 11 W. R. 751.

HIGHWAY ACT—THRESHING MACHINE.—A portable threshing machine employed in threshing corn by the roadside is "erected" within the meaning of the 70th section of 5 & 6 Will. 4, c. 50 (the General Highway Act); and if it is within twenty-five yards of the carriage way, and not properly screened, it renders its owner liable to the penalties imposed by that section.—*Smith, App.*, v. *Stokes, Resp.*, Q. B., 11 W. R. 753.

UNLAWFULLY KILLING PIGEONS.—The provision of 24 & 25 Vict. c. 96, s. 23, which imposes a penalty upon any one who shall "unlawfully and wilfully kill, wound, or take a house-dove or pigeon under such circumstances as shall not amount to larceny at common law," does not apply to a case where the killing, though unlawful, was done by the party for the protection of his own property, and under the *bona fide* belief that he was acting in the exercise of a legal right.—*Taylor, App.*, v. *Newman, Resp.*, Q. B., 11 W. R. 752.

BANKRUPTCY LAW.

COMPOSITION DEED.

Ilderton v. *Castrique*, C. P., 11 W. R. 755; *The General Furnishing Company* v. *Venn*, Ex., 11 W. R. 756.

This is another authority—if one, indeed, were still needed—that a composition deed must relate to all the debts and liabilities of the debtor in order to obtain for him the benefit of the 192nd section of the Bankruptcy Act of 1861. This point is now thoroughly well settled on both sides of Westminster Hall. In *Re Rawlings*, L. J., 11 W. R. 32, the Lords Justices held that in order to bring a case within the section the composition must be with all the creditors. *Walter* v. *Adcock*, Ex., 11 W. R. 542, is a leading authority at common law to the same effect. In that case Bramwell, B., remarked the Act "requires that every such deed shall be between the debtor and his creditors. That means *all* his creditors. . . It is impossible to suppose that the Legislature meant a debtor might arrange with some of his creditors to the exclusion of the others, and yet bind the others." The principle here indicated has governed all the decisions upon the section in question, including the above-named case. In this case the plaintiff obtained judgment against the defendant. Previous to the execution being put in the defendant executed a deed of composition with certain of his creditors, whereby it was agreed that he should pay those who executed 2s. 6d. in the pound, and they granted him a release. The plaintiff did not execute the deed, and the deed did not express to be made for the benefit of the creditors generally. The defendant obtained a protection order under the 198th section; and the Court of Common Pleas held, that the defendant could not avail himself of the benefit of the deed and order as against the plaintiff.

The above-named case of the *General Furnishing Company* v. *Venn* raised the question whether a deed of assignment which conveyed property to trustees for the benefit of all creditors who should execute the same was a deed of assignment within the exception contained in the 7th section of the 17 & 18 Vict. c. 36, and it was there held in the affirmative.

Correspondence.

*** We are requested to state that the note upon the case of Laforest which appeared in last week's *Journal* was not intended for publication.

COURT OF ALDERMEN.

June 16.—At a meeting of Aldermen held at the Mansion-house to-day, the Lord Mayor presiding, the case of deputy Butler, a member of the Court of Common Council for the ward of Farringdon Without, was again brought under consideration. At a previous meeting of the Court the record of a conviction was produced, under the hand of Mr. Maude, police magistrate for the district of Greenwich, by which it appeared that Charles Edward Butler had been convicted before him of three several charges of fraud practised upon the London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway Company. Upon that a notice was served upon the defendant, as he may be designated, calling upon him in effect to attend and show cause to-day, if he was so disposed, why the Court should not proceed to declare his office of common councilman to have been forfeited, in pursuance of the Act 12 & 13 Vict. c. 94, which provides that any member of the Court of Aldermen or Common Council guilty of fraud shall cease to act in that capacity. The defendant did not attend the Court, but sent a letter excusing his non-appearance, which he trusted would not be construed into any want of respect on his part. He stated that the charge brought against him was decided by a magistrate and a penalty inflicted, and that against that decision he entered an appeal, which he had since withdrawn for reasons he assigned. With that explanation he left the matter in the hands of the Court to deal with it as they might think fit. A resolution, in pursuance of the provisions of the Act quoted above, was passed adjudging the office of a common councilman held by the defendant to be vacant, and requesting the Lord Mayor to issue his precept for the election of a successor.

POLICE COURTS.

BOW STREET.

June 12—Mr. Thomas Johnson, solicitor, of Grecian-chambers, Devereux-court, Strand, was summoned before Mr. Henry by the Excise, for selling spirits without a licence, and for delivering the same without a permit.

It appeared that the defendant applied to Mr. Charles H. Petter, a publican in Drury-lane, on the 8th of November to purchase a quantity of gin, which he said he had received from a client named Keily, to whom he had advanced some money on loan, and who had been unable to pay the amount. Several interviews took place, and eventually Potter agreed to purchase sixty gallons of gin, and to send for it. Accordingly, his carman went with a horse and cart to Mr. Johnson's chambers, when he received two casks of gin, and the same night, the defendant having called for the money, Petter paid him £10 on account, stating that he would pay the balance when the gin had been measured. Next day the measuring took place in the presence of a person, who attended on behalf of Johnson, and there appeared to be twenty-three gallons of unsweetened gin and thirty-three and a quarter gallons of sweetened gin. A day or two afterwards Johnson called and received the balance of Petter, making altogether £7 3s. 3d., for which the defendant gave receipts. No permit was ex-

hibited, but the distiller's certificate was handed for Petter's inspection, and he thought that was sufficient.

It was contended for the defendant that the possession of the goods, the same not being contraband, was not an offence against the Excise, and there had been no evidence of the sale by Mr. Johnson, who was not present when the goods were delivered. It was true that Johnson had received the money for the goods supplied, and his explanation of this circumstance was that Keily owed him a bill of costs for business transacted for him. Fearing that he should not get the money in any other way, he applied to Petter for the amount due to Keily for the gin, and deducted his costs. In all other respects the parties to the sale were Keily and Petter only.

Mr. HENRY said it was perfectly clear that Johnson had sold the gin to Petter, and he must, therefore, be convicted on the first count. He supposed the Crown would not press for a conviction on the second count.

Mr. *Welsby*, for the Crown, replied in the negative.

The defendant was then ordered to pay the penalty of £100. Notice of appeal was given.

The penalty on the second count would have been £500.

MARLBOROUGH STREET.

June 16.—Sir Robert Dallas was summoned by a cabdriver, for paying him less than his fare. The cabman took the defendant from Portman-street to Berkeley-street West. The defendant paid him 6d. and went away. He ascertained that his fare should have been 1s., and seeing Sir Robert a few days afterwards he asked him for the sixpence. His request was refused, and he took out a summons.

Sir Robert Dallas contended that the cabman had no right to make this demand, as he had originally made no complaint respecting his fare. The cabman was very abusive.

Mr. TYRWHITT said the question to decide was this,—was the cabman precluded from claiming his fare because he allowed the defendant to go away and did not claim the fare in the first instance? He thought he had a right to make the charge. The cabman must therefore be paid 6d. more, but without costs for attendance.

APPOINTMENTS.

Mr. ROWLAND AUGUSTUS GRIFFITH DAVIES, of Penzance, Cornwall, has been appointed a Commissioner to administer oaths in the High Court of Chancery in England.

Mr. THOMAS GREENSIT HAMER, of Barnsley, York, has been appointed a Commissioner to administer oaths in the High Court of Chancery in England.

Mr. FRANCIS HAMPSON, of Manchester, has been appointed a Commissioner to administer oaths in the High Court of Chancery in England.

Mr. A. B. WARDEN, of the Bombay Civil Service, has been appointed Judge of the High Court, in the room of the Hon. H. Hebbert.

Mr. M. R. WESTROPP, of the Bombay Bar, has been appointed to a seat in the Legislative Council of Bombay.

Mr. EDWARD R. GRIFFITHS, of the Common Law Bar, has been appointed stipendiary magistrate for the Falkland Islands.

GENERAL CORRESPONDENCE.

ARTICLED CLERKS' EXAMINATION.

I take leave—but with hesitation—to address to you a few words as to the examination of articled clerks. This subject is always, in some shape or another, coming up for consideration, and it is, I think, desirable to dispose of it. Much doubt has been expressed as to the duty and responsibility of educating an articled clerk. This is really a singular fact, involving as it does the question whether the master is really to do anything but receive the premium? Let us look at this, and see what reasoning is applicable to the subject.

What is the master's duty? It is clearly—to express it shortly—to instruct his articled clerk in the principles and practice of the profession. This is his express duty, and one which the receipt of the premium devolves on him as the *quid pro quo*. At present articled clerks get little or no instruction from their masters, the premium being literally only a fee for what are called "opportunities for experience." These consist of the use of the master's office and library, and such knowledge as can be acquired casually. Now it must, I think, be admitted that such a state of things is unfair, both to the student and the public. The profession will, I feel assured, see on reflection that a reform is wanted at their hands, and their "sense of honour" will, I trust, speedily bring that about. The question is really one of a domestic character, and a hint will, I trust, be sufficient to arouse the profession to its consideration.

Now, if this duty was—as I submit it should be—performed by masters, a public examination would, I think, be unnecessary. The utility of such an examination has long been doubted, and this is not to be wondered at, since it is a well known fact that cramming is commonly resorted to by students. Though this characterises the universities yet it is nevertheless objectionable as an unhealthy and unsatisfactory method of acquiring knowledge in any department. No doubt the want of a better class of "elementary books" is matter of just complaint, but these are now being gradually supplied. The boast of legal honours obtained by the process to which I refer is, I think, idle, for it cannot possibly make an efficient and a profound lawyer. Why should not the master's certificate of competency be sufficient? It ought, I think, to be received as such; and if masters performed their duty it would unquestionably be the best of tests. The elements of each department of law are comparatively simple when taught by the master's lips and accompanied by familiar illustrations. A student well instructed in these would have a foundation for a noble superstructure—creditable alike to himself and his master. By the discharge of this duty the master would "keep up his knowledge"—an advantage of great personal value. The public would also be supplied with a class of lawyers adequate to the varying emergencies of commercial and domestic life. These views are humbly submitted to your readers for their consideration.

J. CULVERHOUSE.

June 5.

The integrity of the examination of persons applying to be admitted attorneys and solicitors, apart from its moral importance generally, is of sufficient consequence to the profession of which your journal is the organ, to warrant me in seeking publication, through your means, of a few remarks which have been suggested by my own experience, at the recent final examination.

My experience is, and I am sorry to say it is not the only experience of the kind, that, notwithstanding the discouragement given to malpractices, candidates do communicate with, copy, or receive assistance from one another, and that continually, almost undisguisedly, and even in the near vicinity of one or more of the presiding authorities.

I am aware the opinion of many is that the examination to which candidates are subjected is not a test of their qualifications for the profession they seek to enter. Upon this question I will offer no opinion. I apprehend that answering the questions to the examiners' satisfaction is not relied on as a proof, but only as a presumption, of the fitness of candidates, and as evidence that they have in some measure given their attention to the study of the law. As such, however, it is of great importance, and ought to be scrupulously set about; the more so as the examiners are obliged to trust in a great degree to the honour of the men.

But there is another point of view from which the evil of which I have spoken may be regarded, and which (so far as I know) is not often adverted to. Wherever rewards, or honorary distinctions, are conferred upon those who answer best, the examination is a competitive one, and such is the case with the final examination of the Incorporated Law Society; for although the certificates of merit which they award to those who excel in their answers may not be limited in number, at any rate the prizes are. Now this circumstance makes the practice of resorting to the help of others not only dishonest, but unfair; viewed in which light its impropriety is, perhaps, more likely to be recognised by the English mind than in the other. To this consideration I will, therefore, confine it, and without dwelling upon its effect of damaging the superiority of the best men by tending to destroy well earned distinctions, and bring bad and good to the same level (the result of which must necessarily be to raise the standard for certificates of merit), I will merely ask those who from thoughtlessness, or some other cause, allow themselves to have recourse to extraneous aid in answering the questions, with what satisfaction or ease of mind they could accept a Law Society's prize, obtained, it may be, to the exclusion of more deserving, but more conscientious competitors?

I trust, Sir, that these few reflections may have the effect of checking so pernicious and prevalent an abuse, and that those

who offer themselves in future to enter what the president of the examination reminded us was "an honourable profession," will be studious to avoid even the appearance of a dishonourable practice. VIRTUS VIRET ET VIREBIT.

8th June.

INTERMEDIATE EXAMINATIONS.

Will you kindly allow me through the columns of your journal, again to call the attention of the examiners to the unnecessary expense to which they put candidates for the above examination by selecting as one of the works for this examination "the second book of Stephen's Commentaries," which cannot be obtained without purchasing the whole four volumes at an expense of four guineas.

As the works for these examinations for the ensuing year are to be selected in July next, the examiners would confer a favour on articled clerk if they were to select some less expensive work which would furnish the requisite information, and would be equally as useful to AN ARTICLED CLERK.

June 16.

CONVEYANCING ANSWER No. 2.—TRINITY TERM.

The correctness of the answer to the second conveyancing question for Trinity Term, 1863, contained in No. 4 of the *Legal Examiner*, having been questioned by your correspondent "A. B.," will you allow me to refer him to "Jarman on Wills," vol. 2, p. 283, where it is stated that "If the testator has affixed no express limit to the duration of the trust, the estate of the trustees, even though the devise is *to the use of* the trustees, will, as in other cases, be measured by the exigencies of the trust or duty imposed on the trustees." Therefore, if A. could have executed the trust by taking a limited estate, he would only have taken a limited estate, and not one in fee. The question is unfortunately of too open a nature to arrive at any very satisfactory conclusion as to what the trusts were, and all the cases beginning with *Venables* v. *Morris*, 7 T. R. 342, turned upon the trusts limited in each case. It was to set these difficulties at rest that ss. 30 and 31 of the Wills Act were passed, and the question was no doubt suggested by this enactment. Had no reference been made to the Wills Act, the question would have come within the case of *Moore* v. *Cleghorn*, 12 Jur. 591, which decides that a devise to trustees in fee in trust for A., without words of limitation, gives the fee to A. This, however, is not affected by the Wills Act, and was not the case contemplated by the examiner. The reason of B.'s estate not being stated in the answer arose, probably, from the question having originally been without inquiry as to B.'s estate. Students are aware of the difficulties under which the questions are obtained, and will excuse an occasional inaccuracy. B. will take in equity what A. takes at law. I very much regret being compelled to write at such length on a question which is now of little practical importance. The publication of bad law is unpardonable; and, in order to remove any doubts which the letter of your correspondent may have created as to the answer given in the *Legal Examiner*, you will oblige me by giving publicity to this letter.

CHARLES H. ANDERSON.

69, Lincoln's-inn-fields. June 18.

LEGAL REWARDS.

W. H. B. may rest assured that nothing will persuade lawyers that the examination prizes are not proofs of proficiency in legal knowledge—whether theoretical or practical, I do not care to distinguish, because all must admit that an energetic stirring man with a good theoretical knowledge of his profession is much more likely to make a successful practitioner than the same kind of man without such knowledge.

When W. H. B. speaks of the confidence we country solicitors possess, let him, in common fairness to us, ask himself how we could get on without it.

Take myself, for instance. I may have half-a-dozen clients in a morning—one on a point of commercial law, another on a conveyancing question, another on a magisterial case, &c., and something may be required to be done instantly in each matter. Being in a town too small to support resident counsel, I am two day's distant from better advice than my own, and if I am not self-reliant I may as well give up my practice.

No one is more willing than I am to admit the knowledge of my London brethren, but I cannot concede to them, and, from the fact of London firms chiefly confining themselves to one branch of practice, they do not even claim, any great grasp of general law. Let us, therefore, not undervalue each other: my London agents have an acquaintance with equity and common law infinitely superior to mine, but they would smile at the idea of their correcting such blunders as W. H. B. alludes to. A COUNTRY SOLICITOR.

June 18.

COUNTY COURT STATISTICS.

I think the following facts with reference to the county courts for the year 1861 may be interesting to your readers.

* The amount for which judgments were obtained in these courts amounted to £1,076,556.

	£	£	£
* The fees levied on suitors amounted to	277,148		
* Costs paid by suitors	43,413		
Amount paid by suitors		320,566	
† The amount granted by Parliament for expenses not provided for by the fees	257,075		
‡ Pensions charged on the Consolidated Fund by the Act (9 & 10 Vict. c. 95) establishing these courts	8,760		
Amount granted by Parliament		265,835	
			586,401
§ To this may be added the cost of the debtors imprisoned, who in that year were 8,635, estimated at			10,000
Total costs of these courts			596,401

Of £849,509 voted by Parliament in 1861 for the various courts of law and equity in England (Thom's Directory for 1863, page 79), £265,835, or nearly one-third, was for county courts. It will be seen that these courts cost the nation annually upwards of a quarter of a million. Now sir, are the advantages derived by the public from these courts sufficient to compensate for such a large annual expenditure? I hope some gentleman will be able to suggest a cheaper method of recovering small debts; or otherwise it would be much the wisest plan to pass an Act making all such debts irrecoverable.

June 15. A CONSTANT READER.

THE INNS OF COURT HOTEL COMPANY.

The enclosed circular needs no comment:—

Inns of Court Hotel Company (Limited),
73, Cheapside, London,
March 3, 1863.

Sir,—The directors request me to inform you that the commission of 2s. 6d. per share will be allowed to solicitors, equally with brokers, on all shares procured by them to be taken in this company.

I shall feel obliged by your making known to your clients the resolution on the other side.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,
THOMAS WAITE, Sec. *pro tem.*

At a board meeting held the 26th ultimo, the following resolutions were passed,—

"That sufficient capital having been subscribed to carry out the undertaking, it is advisable that the share list be shortly closed.'

"That the purchase of the property be completed forthwith, and that the buildings be commenced as speedily as possible."

Applications for the remaining shares should therefore be made immediately to the bankers, brokers, solicitors, or secretary.

THE STATUS OF COUNSEL.

The case of *Kennedy* v. *Brown and Wife* decides that the relation of counsel and client renders the parties mutually incapable of entering into any legal contract of hiring and service concerning advocacy in litigation, and that no claim for compensation can be maintained by a counsel for services which are ancillary to the service as advocate. The judgment

* See Judicial Statistics for 1861, page 106.

† See Thom's British Directory and Official Handbook of the United Kingdom for 1863, page 79.

‡ See Finance Accounts for 1861-2, pages 53, 54, and 55.

§ This amount is estimated as if the average number of days each debtor remained in prison was seventeen—the same as in 1859 (see page 150 of Judicial Statistics for 1861)—as these particulars have not been given in the statistics published since.

of the Court of Common Pleas goes very fully into the relationship of counsel and their clients, and the subject is so interesting to many of your readers that I propose to make some remarks on it. It is well known that if an adequate fee is not marked upon, and in many cases paid on the delivery of, a brief, it will remain unread in the counsel's chambers, and that if an erroneous opinion is given, all the client can do is to insist on his solicitor employing another counsel. The mischief in all probability would then have been done, the erroneous advice acted upon, and several hundreds of pounds lost to the client; in the case of the unread brief a similar loss would no doubt arise. I would ask if this is a satisfactory state of things? Certain counsel have such extensive employment that they demand what fees they choose, attend to few or none of these cases, compromise or refer against the expressed wish of their clients, and in fact do just as they please in every respect. A case occurred the other day where an action was brought for substantial damages, and a very eminent counsel insisted on a very large fee before he would appear for the plaintiff. When the case came on, he said that nominal damages only were sought, and agreed to a reference, the fact being that he had not read a line of his brief and wanted to get away. This conduct on his part entailed a loss of about £500 on his client, but what remedy has he? This is by no means an unfrequent case—on the contrary it is one of daily occurrence. If the client tries to conduct his case himself, he usually loses it—his solicitor may not conduct it, though the client has full confidence in him. The utter dissatisfaction caused by the present state of things leads parties to compromise their rights in any way rather than to bring actions. If a counsel's clerk says his employer will not go into court under a certain fee, does it not amount to a hiring, according to common sense, if that fee is paid? But if the counsel does not fulfil his part of the bargain, why should he not be compelled to disgorge the fee? The judgment of the Court goes on the assumption that the service of the advocate is beyond all price to the client; if so, the counsel ought to be as well content with two as with two hundred guineas. I think all solicitors will agree with me that nothing can be so unsatisfactory as the present status of counsel, and will join with me in desiring that the subject should receive full consideration in the proper quarters.

A MANAGING CLERK.

Lower Calthorpe-street.

PARLIAMENT AND LEGISLATION.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Friday, June 12.

REVISION OF THE STATUTE LAW.

The LORD CHANCELLOR, who had given notice of his intention to call the attention of the House to the present state of the statute law, and of the reports of decisions in the Courts of Law and Equity, and to introduce a bill for the revision of the statute law, said,—I rise to make a statement with reference to the revision and expurgation of the statute law, from the earliest commencement of our legislation down to the beginning of the seventeenth century—the legislation, in fact, of about 500 years. Accordingly, at an early period, it became necessary for the protection of liberty, in order to get some kind of approach to uniformity, constancy, and regularity in the law, that the grounds and reasons of the judges' decisions should be given. At first an attempt was made to do so by entering the reasons for the judgments in the rolls of the court; and our court rolls, preserved from the time of Richard I., contain repeatedly the reasons for the decisions and sentences. At the latter end of the reign of Edward II., or in the beginning of the reign of Edward III., the practice of reporting the decisions of the judges began, and from that period down we have a series of judicial reports of those decisions. These reports were kept for a considerable period of time under the superintendence of the judges themselves, and great care was taken in sifting and ascertaining the grounds of the decision. The evil was, therefore, comparatively little; but in course of time, as the reports multiplied and as the personal superintendence and care of the judges were withdrawn, great complaints began to arise; and so much inconvenience was felt that, as early as the time of Lord Bacon, it became a subject of general dissatisfaction, which attracted his attention, and led to his compiling and publishing his celebrated book for the amendment of the law of England. In the time of Lord Bacon these reports extended to about 60 or 70 volumes. During the 250 years that have passed since then, nothing has been done in the way of revision or expurgation; but these 60 or 70 volumes have grown to between 1,100 and 1,200 volumes. The first thing to be done with these reports is to revise and to expurgate them, to weed them of decisions that are in contradiction with one another; where there are opposing decisions to settle those which ought to remain; to cleanse out and to get rid of all matters that are not warranted by the present state of the law, and to divide the reports into three classes. The first class would include all the old reports to the end of the seventeenth century; the second would include the reports of the eighteenth century to the death of George III.; and the third would include the reports to the present time. I trust I may be successful in obtaining a commission that may be directed for the purpose of accomplishing these objects. As to the old reports, I propose that we should preserve the conclusions properly came to; that in the second period we should weed the reports of what is useless, and retain only those cases which are fit to be used as precedents; and to perform a similar work in respect of cases of the present time. The result will be a body of recorded precedents brought into a moderate compass, and occupying, we may estimate, but a tenth of the bulk of the present reports. The law thus purified and refined, the grounds of contradiction, if not entirely removed, will be materially reduced and a much more satisfactory state of things will be the result. Such is the present state of the common law. I now turn for a few moments to the corresponding state of the statute law, for there is a remarkable similarity between them. The statute law is contained in forty-three or forty-four thick quarto volumes, commencing with the 20th of Henry III. They are printed without the least regard to order; there is no system or arrangement in regard to them. They are printed just as they had been passed, chronologically. This, then, being the state of the law and of the statute book, what I propose is the course dictated by natural good sense, that it shall be revised and expurgated—weeding away all those enactments that are no longer in force, and arranging and classifying what is left under proper heads, bringing the dispersed statutes together, eliminating jarring and discordant enactments, and thus getting a harmonious whole, instead of having, as at present, a chaos of inconsistent and contradictory enactments. The statutes that are weeded out may be described as those which are no longer applicable to the modern state of society,—enactments which have become wholly obsolete—enactments which have been repealed by obscure and indirect processes, which is one of the evils with which we have to contend, because it perpetually happens that a particular enactment is in effect repealed without its being said so by the indirect process of another general law. Sometimes it is repealed by the introduction of another inconsistent rule, and while these things prevail, until they are extirpated from the statute-book they are constantly the cause of uncertainty. I may just bring to your recollection how common it is in a modern Act of Parliament to say, "all former enactments inconsistent with this Act are hereby repealed?" Or you repeal so much of an Act as relates to such and such a matter. It is often extremely difficult to determine what is included in the words "relating to." We have endeavoured to apply a remedy to this state of things. The task was one of great difficulty and delicacy. The reason for every alteration will be found in the schedule given opposite to the description of the enactment to which it applies. This was done in order that this work might be accomplished with something like that certainty and assurance of safety with which work of this kind ought always to be gone into. In carrying out this plan, of course it becomes most desirable to preserve intact all those ancient monuments of our legislation connected with our political rights and institutions, on which no man should lay his unhallowed hands. Those statutes which may be considered to have become stones in the edifice of the Constitution are preserved wholly intact; and no enactment or statute is touched that may be considered to have entered into the common law, or formed the foundation of any rule of practice or procedure, or may be referred to as the basis on which the right or title of property is made to rest. Such a work required great care and circumspection, so that in the process of excision no existing right should be impaired. When this is done, when the statute-book has been cleared of superfluous and unnecessary matter, I hope to propose that another process be gone through to which the previous observance is merely introductory. The enactments spread throughout the statute-book relating to different subjects must be brought together in a collected form. I should propose, therefore, to have a systematic classification of the subject-matter of your legislation, preserving, however, the order

of time, because the order of time in regard to enactments is most material for the proper understanding of the law, but arranging the different portions of the statute-book under appropriate heads, so as to present an accurate and methodical analysis of the law comprised under each head. And I hope, concurrently with this, that the corresponding parts of the common law extracted from the reports may be added, so that in that shape you may have a digest of the present law, both common and statute. I use the word digest advisedly, because your Lordships may frequently hear any procedure of this kind described as an approach to codification. Undoubtedly this task requires a great deal more labour than the weak force placed at my disposal under the grant made by Parliament could accomplish. But, my Lords, the work that has been done has been the work of several years; yet you will not be surprised at that period having been occupied by it when I tell you that the services of two gentlemen only are at the command of the Lord Chancellor and the law officers of the Crown, and those two gentlemen receive such inadequate salaries, that they are enabled to give up only such hours to this employment as they can subtract from their ordinary professional avocations. If this proposal be prosecuted with effect, I should hope that the process of revision and expurgation will not take much more than another year; and then the arrangement and classification of the different subjects of our enactments may be proceeded with. In that way we may expect to have the body of our statutes relieved from the chaotic state of disorder in which it now stands. I trust, my Lords, that the commission will also direct its inquiries into another important point, because it is of no use to reduce, expurgate, methodize, and arrange that which exists, unless we have a means of preventing the recurrence of the evils which now exist. If your Lordships should confirm that view, I shall undoubtedly at some future time ask you to give me a committee for the purpose of ascertaining what is the best mode by which the future legislation of this country may be conducted so as to secure an improved form in the composition of bills. When the task of expurgating and classifying the statutes has been completed, it will still be necessary to adopt some system for revising the enormous amount of accumulated decisions, so as to check the uncertainty and confusion they introduce into the law. A case is decided, say by a Vice-Chancellor, or by one of the courts at Westminster, the decision may be bad, but one of the parties to the litigation may not have the means of appealing against it, and so it is not corrected by a higher court. Then this bad law is recorded in the reports, and passes unnoticed for three or four years. It is then cited as a precedent before another judge. That other judge says, "I find that Mr. Justice A. B., or Mr. Vice-Chancellor C. D., decided a case from which the case now before me cannot be distinguished;" and thus a bad precedent is accepted and confirmed. The thing, therefore, becomes inveterate, and bad law is established. There ought to be an annual revision of the reported cases, with power to determine what is to be regarded as entitled to authority, and what ought not to be quoted hereafter for the purpose of determining the law. All this might be accomplished by what is called the institution of a Department of Justice. At all events there ought to be some mode and power of revising these reports from time to time, as long as you adhere to the practice of making them guides for judicial decisions.

Lord BROUGHAM said, the revision of the statute law would be a most useful, but, at the same time, a very difficult operation, and he believed it could only be done in one way, viz., by Parliament giving its confidence to certain individuals, and adopting the result of their labours almost as a matter of course. If bills consisting of between 100 and 200 clauses each were to be discussed in all their stages in both Houses very little progress could be made. He joined with his noble and learned friend in lamenting that we had not a Department of Justice, though he thought it would be entirely out of the question to allow it to have anything whatever to do with revising the decisions of the courts of law and equity. That the reports contained many bad decisions was a fact which could not be disputed, but the only way in which those decisions could be altered was by enacting that the law was otherwise.

Lord CRANWORTH said, with regard to the first object proposed by his noble and learned friend, the consolidation and abridgment of the decisions of the different courts, that though he should be most happy to find himself mistaken, he was afraid that his noble and learned friend had undertaken an impossible task. It was a fallacy to talk about there being any doubt as to what the law was. Except in one or two disputed cases there was no difficulty in ascertaining what the law was; but it was impossible, of course, to make a law *ab ante* which would exactly meet all the different combinations of facts which arose in the varying circumstances of social life. All that could be done was to apply the analogies of all former cases to the new circumstances which arose from time to time. If a new state of circumstances was not properly governed by former principles, it became then the duty of Parliament to interfere and make a new law. With regard to the second branch of the subject, there were more difficulties in the consolidation or revision of the statute law than were apparent at first sight. In any attempt to consolidate and revise the statute law so as to make anything like a complete system of it, there was this difficulty at the outset,—the whole law of the country might be codified, but it was impossible to codify the statute law, which was simply a supplement to rectify the omissions of the unwritten law. When he held the Great Seal he came to the conclusion that the best mode of consolidating the statutes was to begin with the statutes passed in the last session, and to read them through section by section, and to see exactly what had been done by Parliament on every subject; then to take the session before, and so on, working backwards. This had been done up to the commencement of the century, and if it were continued he had no doubt that the work of revision and expurgation would in time be completed.

Lord KINGSDOWN said that, in addition to the difficulty mentioned by the noble and learned lord, there was this further difficulty,—no doubt the statute law might be consolidated, and the consolidation would show exactly what was the existing law of England at the moment, but they had a Parliament sitting every year, and altering the law perhaps on a dozen different subjects, and thus making the code imperfect.

The LORD CHANCELLOR having made a few observations in reply,

The bill was read a first time.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, June 11.

CONVEYANCE OF LAND TO CHARITABLE USES AMENDMENT BILL.

The SOLICITOR-GENERAL obtained leave to bring in a bill, to further amend the law relating to the conveyance of land for charitable uses.

The bill was read a first time.

Monday, June 15.

ATTORNEYS' CERTIFICATE DUTY.

Mr. KINNAIRD presented a petition from the Society of Procurators and Solicitors of the city and county of Perth, in favour a repeal of the attorneys' certificate tax.

Tuesday, June 16.

EXECUTION OF DECREES BILL.

Mr. MURRAY presented a petition from the Metropolitan and Provincial Law Association, in favour of the Execution of Decrees Bill, praying an extension of its enactment, and that the orders and decrees of any other court of common law in the United Kingdom might be enforced by any other court having jurisdiction in that part of the United Kingdom in which such orders or decrees are required to be enforced.

HIGHWAY ACT.

Sir W. MILES asked the law officers of the Crown whether, in the construction of the following sentence in the schedule of the Highways Act—viz., "All questions shall be decided by a majority of votes of the members present," it was necessary that there should be a majority of the persons present, or whether it was sufficient that there should be a majority of those who, being present, gave their votes.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said that considerable diversity of opinion existed on the question, and that it had not yet received a judicial decision; but, taking the words of the Act in their plain grammatical construction, he should say that an actual majority must be an actual majority of those present voting.

ASSIZE AND CIRCUIT ARRANGEMENTS

Mr. M'MAHON rose to move "that it is expedient to make such alterations in the assize and circuit arrangements as would secure a more speedy trial in the country of country causes." His object in proposing this resolution was to obtain the carrying out of the recommendations of the commission which had sat upon the subject, and which recommended that country assizes should be held more frequently. Whilst in the country there were but two assizes in the year for the trial of causes, there were in London and Middlesex no fewer than ninety-six, for there were annually thirty-two sittings of each of the three

courts. This was an extraordinary anomaly; and it was also an anomaly that, whilst county courts sat twelve times a year, causes involving more than £50 could only be heard in the country twice in the year. In the time of King John there were four county assizes, and at a later period there were three. The tendency of modern times had been to concentrate legal business in London. In 1648 there were 452 causes tried in the county of Oxford, and from 1780 to 1849 the average was only 132. The tendency towards London monopoly had at last produced dissatisfaction in the country, where suitors must either wait half a year, or incur the expense of coming to London; and nothing was more common than for defendants to settle on any terms rather than incur the cost and inconvenience of a trial in London. The Manchester Chamber of Commerce had adopted a memorial declaring that the present system involved a denial of justice, and that it ought to be maintained only on weighty and undeniable grounds of public security, and it was owing to such memorials from various law societies and towns in the country that the commission to which he had referred was appointed and inquired into the expediency of having a third assize in the country generally. The commissioners would have recommended additional assizes, but what restrained them was that they felt that to accomplish this change additional judges must be appointed. The Incorporated Law Society of London reported that, considering the long interval of eight months between the summer and spring circuits, it was submitted that there should be a third circuit, and that the terms should be reduced to three by either Easter or Trinity term being abolished. One great objection to the present system was that of having assizes held in so few towns, which necessitated taking parties and witnesses far from their homes; and it was calculated that taking witnesses more than thirty miles doubled the costs of a trial. If this were so there would be an enormous saving if assize towns were more numerous, and if there were three circuits, which would prevent many country causes being set down for trial in London—a saving which would far more than counterbalance the expense of having two or three extra judges. When the commission reported there was a notion that the judges, in consequence of the establishment of county courts, would not have enough to do; but it was now, on the contrary, demonstrated that, from the increase of business, and from the fact that causes were now tried out instead of being disposed upon technical objections, the judges were more hardly worked than they had ever been before. Judges had to go into the Divorce Court, the House of Lords, and elsewhere, and the consequence was that the courts, as a rule, seldom had their full complement of judges sitting, and on one occasion he had seen one judge sitting in banco. The wonder indeed was that more judges had not already been appointed. In England there were but fifteen common law judges to dispose of the legal business of 20,000,000 of a commercial people, whilst in Ireland there were twelve judges for an agricultural population of 6,000,000, and Scotland had thirteen judges, in the Inner and Outer House, though the population was only 3,000,000. Nothing could be worse than to have judges so pressed with business that they had to proceed hastily with their work, for "haste was the mother of injustice." He did not want to go into the details of the question, which he had no doubt could be easily settled by the Attorney-General if the House should sanction the principle.

Mr. HADFIELD, in seconding the motion, said that some alteration like that proposed had become of vital importance to the north of England, and particularly to such places as Sheffield. From this town they had to travel fifty-five miles to York to try their causes and their prisoners, whilst in Lancashire, which was a much smaller county, they had three assize towns. The expense was not at all to be estimated in comparison with the immense advantages to be derived from the change proposed. There was no place in the United Kingdom suffering from so great a disadvantage in this respect as the west riding of Yorkshire; and he appealed to the Attorney-General, who was well aware of the inconvenience, to assist in its removal.

Mr. BAINES supported the views of the previous speaker, and bore his testimony to the grievance existing in the west riding of Yorkshire. Leeds had a population of 207,000, Sheffield 185,000, Bradford and Halifax each over 100,000, and many of the other towns had populations of 50,000 or 60,000; and in consequence of the limited assize accommodation the administration of justice was far from satisfactory. Leeds had every accommodation for holding assizes, and the people there considered themselves ill-treated by what at present was a denial of justice.

Sir F. CROSSLEY was proceeding to speak in support of the motion, when, there being only thirty-four members present the House was counted out at ten minutes to ten o'clock.

Thursday, June 18.

ATTORNEYS' CERTIFICATE DUTY.

Mr. MURRAY presented a petition from the Metropolitan and Provincial Law Association, for the repeal of this tax.

Pending Measures of Legislation.

A BILL TO ENLARGE THE SHERIFF'S SMALL DEBT JURISDICTION IN SCOTLAND.

The following bill has been brought into the House of Commons by Mr. Caird.

After reciting the 7 Will. 4 and 1 Vict. c. 41, 1 & 2 Vict. c. 119, and 16 & 17 Vict. c. 80, the bill proposes to enact as follows:—

1. The summary jurisdiction of the sheriff, as exercised under the said recited Acts in the small debt court, shall be and is hereby enlarged to £25, and the words £25 shall be held to be inserted, and be read in said recited Acts wherever the words eight pounds six shillings and eight-pence, and twelve pounds respectively occur as fixing the limit of said jurisdiction.

2. Where the sum claimed or value in dispute exceeds £8 6s. 8d. it shall be competent for parties to plead by agents or procurators duly admitted to plead in the ordinary court of the sheriff, and costs of suit shall be allowed according to the table of fees existing at the time for the ordinary court, so far as applicable to such summary forms of procedure.

3. In addition to the appeal allowed by the 31st section of the Act first recited, on the special grounds therein set forth, it shall be competent to either party, if dissatisfied with the judgment of the sheriff in point of law in any case exceeding in value the sum of £12, and in other cases by special leave of the sheriff, to appeal from such judgment to either of the divisions of the court of session: provided that such party shall within ten days after such judgment, give notice of such appeal to the other party or his agent, and also find security to the satisfaction of the clerk of court for the costs of the appeal, and for payment of any sum or sums which may be found due by such appellant.

4. The appeal shall be in the form of a case agreed on by both parties or their agents, and if they cannot agree the the sheriff shall settle the case and sign it; and such case shall be forthwith transmitted by the sheriff clerk to the principal clerk of the division which the appellant shall mark on the case, to be entered on the summar roll of such division; and the judges of such division may cause judgment to be entered for either party, or may remit the case to the sheriff with directions, or pronounce such order on the merits or with respect to costs, or otherwise as they shall think fit; and such judgment or order shall be final and conclusive.

5. The judges of the court of session are hereby authorized and required from time to time to make such regulations as they shall think proper in regard to such appeals, and specially for facilitating their disposal with the least possible expense and delay; and such regulations shall be submitted to and approved of by one of Her Majesty's principal secretaries of state, and shall be in force from the date of such approval.

6. A sheriff substitute, in regard to eligibility for promotion, shall be held to be practising in the profession of the law during the entire period of his holding the office of sheriff substitute.

A BILL TO FURTHER AMEND THE LAW RELATING TO THE CONVEYANCE OF LAND FOR CHARITABLE USES.

The following bill has been brought into the House of Commons by the Solicitor-General:—

Whereas by 24 Vict. c. 9, intituled "An Act to amend the law relating to the conveyance of land for charitable uses," it was amongst other things enacted, that "no deed or assurance theretofore made, and under which possession was then held for any charitable uses whatsoever, of any hereditaments of any tenure whatsoever, or of any estate or interest therein, made really and *bonâ fide* for a full and valuable consideration actually paid at or before the making or perfecting such deed or assurance, or reserved by way of rent, rent-charge, or other annual payment, or partly paid at or before the making or perfecting such deed or assurance, and partly reserved as aforesaid, without fraud or collusion, should for any reason whatever be deemed to be null and void within the meaning of the first therein-recited Act (9 Geo. 2. c. 36, intituled 'An Act to restrain the disposition of lands, whereby the same become inalienable'), if

such deed or assurance was made to take effect for the charitable uses intended immediately from the making thereof, and without any power of revocation, and had been at any time prior to the passing of that Act, or should be within twelve calender months next after the passing of that Act, enrolled in Her Majesty's High Court of Chancery:" and whereas by the 25 & 26 Vict. c. 17, intituled "An Act to extend the time for making enrolments under an Act passed in the last session of Parliament, intituled 'An Act to amend the law relating to the conveyance of land for charitable uses,' and to explain and amend the said Act, the time for making enrolments under the said first recited Act was extended till the 17th of May, 1864; and it was thereby further provided, that in all cases in which money should have been really and *bona fide* expended before the passing of that Act in the substantial and permanent improvement, by building or otherwise, for any charitable use, of land of any tenure whatsoever, of which possession was then held by virtue of any deed or assurance conveying or purporting to convey the same, or declaring any trusts or trust thereof for such charitable use, all money so expended should be deemed, for the purposes of the said Act, equivalent to money actually paid by way of consideration for the purchase of the said land: and whereas it is expedient that the said Acts should be further amended: be it therefore enacted by the Queen's most excellent Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons, in this present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, as follows:

1. Every deed or assurance by which any land shall have been demised for any term of years for any charitable use shall, for all the purposes of the said recited Acts, be deemed to have been made to take effect for the charitable use thereby intended immediately from the making thereof, if the term for which such land shall have been thereby demised was thereby made to commence and take effect in possession at any time within one year from the date of such deed or assurance.

2. Any expenditure in the substantial and permanent improvement of any land held for any charitable use, *bonâ fide* made within the meaning of the said last-recited Act, shall be deemed sufficient to entitle the charity for which such land is held to the benefit of the said first-recited Act, if the same would have been in all other respects entitled thereto, although such expenditure may not have been made at or before the making or perfecting the deed or assurance under which such land is held for such charitable use, and although no contract or stipulation for that purpose may have been contained in such deed or assurance.

IRELAND.

On Monday a meeting of members of the Bar was held in the library of the Four Courts, for the purpose of considering whether members of the inner bar ought to sign pleadings at law or equity unless countersigned by junior counsel. The result of the meeting was that a committee, consisting of twelve Queen's Counsel and twelve members of the outer Bar, was appointed to examine the subject, and report to the next meeting.

FOREIGN TRIBUNALS & JURISPRUDENCE.

AMERICA.

The Supreme Judicial Court of New Hampshire has recently decided that the sale of the goodwill of a business will take from the seller the right to continue, or in any way holding himself out as continuing, the identical business the goodwill of which he had sold, but will not necessarily prevent him from engaging in a similar business that is not, and does not purport to be a continuation of the old one; and that the sale of a newspaper and subscription list and printing establishment, together with the goodwill thereof, will not exclude the seller from the right to publish a new and different newspaper, and, in connection with his newspaper, a new printing office which is not a continuation of the old business.

SOCIETIES AND INSTITUTIONS.

THE LAW AMENDMENT SOCIETY.

The Augmentation of Benefices Bill.

Dr. Waddilove has recently read before the Law Amendment Society a paper on the sale of benefices, in connection with Lord Chancellor Westbury's bill for the "augmentation of benefices."

The object of the bill is to enable the sale of the smaller of the Crown advowsons, for the purpose of applying the proceeds towards the increase of the yearly value of each. The yearly income of each of those scheduled in the bill, which are exclusively within the Chancellor's gift, does not average more than £160—a sum clearly inadequate to the position and support of an incumbent. The Lord Chancellor contemplated that from the sum to be raised by the sales of these advowsons their yearly income will be increased two-thirds, and in some instances one-half. The Bounty Act, and some subsequent statutes afforded some remedy, but much remains to be done. The object of Dr. Waddilove's paper is to call attention to an important alteration which has been made in the bill as it passed through the select committee. The 32nd clause of the bill, as it originally stood, ran thus:—"Any advowson may be lawfully sold and conveyed under this Act, *notwithstanding that the church is vacant*. . . . Any clerk may at any time purchase an advowson under this Act and present himself." That clause has been expunged by the committee. It was a great innovation, and a direct permission for the commission of the offence known to us as simony: the purchase of a void benefice by a layman, although it is said to involve the cure of souls, is a venial offence compared with that of a clergyman buying a vacant benefice and presenting himself.

Dr. Waddilove, after giving a historical view of the law of simony from the earliest times down to the reign of Queen Anne, proceeds to observe that—

The law as established by the Acts of Elizabeth is based on the doctrine of the canon law of Rome, which has so blended the temporalities and the spiritualities as to consider them as both passing by the transfer of a benefice: and thus, in order to carry out that theory without invading the rights attaching to church property, many incongruous anomalies have of necessity arisen. When a living is vacant it can be purchased by no one, whether lay or clergy. This results from the 5th section of the statute of Elizabeth, which in direct terms declares that "the presentation for money or reward to a benefice, with cure of souls, shall be utterly void, and that the presentation for that turn shall lapse to the crown, and that the corrupt patron shall forfeit the double value of one year's profit of the benefice, and the corrupt presentee be disabled from holding the same benefice at the hands of any other person." If there be any actual sin or offence in the sale or transfer of a benefice for any consideration, it would be certainly most palpable when the living is vacant: but here I must remark, that which is transferred is but the temporal benefit arising therefrom, which is not acquired until induction has taken place, and may be termed the temporal investiture, since the incumbent is thereby clothed with all the attributes incidental to the complete possession of his benefice; and then, and not till then, does he enter on the profits of it, and become (as Blackstone tells us) a complete "*parson imparsonee*."

If the vacant benefice be not filled up within six months after notice of avoidance given to the patron by the bishop of the diocese or other ordinary, the presentation lapses—first to the bishop, then to the metropolitan, and lastly to the Crown. In order to prevent this lapse, and to enable the patron to sell the next presentation, it is his policy to find some clerk in orders far advanced in years—and the more infirm in health the better for his purpose—since the near prospect of the incumbent's death enhances the value of the next presentation. The bishop, under a sense of the duty imposed upon him by law—viz., that he is bound to admit a presentee if he be sufficiently learned and not of unsound doctrine, notwithstanding he may be physically incapable of discharging the duties attached to his office—is reluctant to refuse him institution. The living becomes full, and is then a marketable commodity, and forthwith an advertisement appears putting forth the advanced age of the present incumbent, and the prospect of early possession, as an inducement to purchasers.

That this is repulsive to religious feeling and decency none will deny; but it may be said that if the sale of presentations to vacant benefices is legalised, attractive advertisements respecting them will still be put forth. Granted; but we shall then be spared the spectacle of a decrepit old man invested with sacred duties which his age and infirmities render him incapable of discharging; and the patron will escape from the necessity of resorting to the degrading alternative of presenting one whom he knows tobe unable to discharge the sacred obligations he has undertaken; and he will be in a position to declare at once, honestly and openly, that the living is vacant, and that he is desirous of selling it; and if he is at liberty to sell it at all, it is absurd to prohibit him from doing so when it is of most value—that is

when it is vacant; and if, moreover, as I contend, nothing spiritual passes by the transfer of a benefice, it is unreasonable as it is unjust to preclude from sale an interest of which the purchaser may become at once possessed, but at the same time to permit the sale of that same interest in reversion. Again, this statute may be evaded by the purchaser of the next presentation to the living, when full, paying the incumbent sufficient to induce him to resign. It is true when the would-be incumbent presents himself for institution, he takes on oath that he has neither directly or indirectly given any thing to procure his preferment—this he may oft-times conscientiously do. The arrangement is made for him through parental or some other friendly medium. The statute, however, preventing the purchase of a vacant living, is practically defeated; and although the scruples of those who have such a dread of the purchase of the cure of souls may be saved, still the dispassionate mind cannot but admit that the living, for the purposes both of the purchaser and vendor, is in reality vacant.

But it is said that in buying a presentation, even to a full benefice, a clergyman is bartering for the cure of souls. Here I must remark that the spiritualities are confounded with the temporalities; it is the latter alone which virtually and *de facto* pass by the conveyance of the benefice. The purchaser already in orders has the privilege of the cure of souls vested in him by virtue his ordination; it is in abeyance when he has no cure, but may be evoked and put in action when he is licensed to a curacy, or instituted to a benefice; but nothing essentially of a religious or sacred character passes by the transfer of the temporalities.

A not uncommon practice prevails, sanctioned by the episcopacy and encouraged by devout friends of the church, as calculated to increase church accommodation—namely, the payment of a large sum towards the erection of a church by a clergyman himself or his friends, upon the condition that he shall be the first incumbent of the new district church. The law is evaded by the specious allegation that at the time the money was subscribed for or paid the church was not consecrated—there was no cure of souls attached to it; but how far this differs from purchasing the next presentation to that incumbency I must leave to more learned casuists to determine. Again, how frequently is a title to orders obtained by an express stipulation with the incumbent that the curate, when ordained, shall undertake the duties of his office, for a time, for a mere nominal stipend? What is this but his paying the incumbent, whose curate he becomes, so much—the stipend he would, in the absence of any such agreement, receive—for discharging the duties of that incumbent's cure?

Another inconvenience in the present state of the law, showing, however, the distinction between the temporalities and the spiritualities, arises where, in consequence of the bishop refusing to institute the patron's nominee, a twofold process may be carried on at one and the same time—one in the temporal court, in the form of a *quære impedit*, at the suit of the patron; the other in that of a *duplex querela* in the ecclesiastical court, at the suit of the rejected clergyman. The same issue may be involved in both courts. The two suits may proceed at one and the same time, with probably different results.

To further illustrate the position for which I am contending—viz., that the spiritualities and the temporalities of a benefice are distinct from each other, and that the latter alone are involved in the sale and transfer of a benefice—I will adduce the ancient mode of investiture to ecclesiastical dignities—a subject productive of much strife between royalty and the popedom, which ended in the arrangement that the sovereign should invest bishops with their temporal honours and possessions, and the pope with their spiritual rights, powers, and privileges. The election of our bishops at the present day is, in spirit, analogous to that practice. The *congè d' elire* emanates from the sovereign, and is but a permission in name: although the dean and chapter ostensibly elect the bishop, he is virtually the nominee of the crown; if they do not elect within twelve days after the receipt of the letters missive, the sovereign may elect by letters patent. Confirmation and consecration, then, give the spiritual sanction and authority; but it is homage to the sovereign which crowns the whole by which the bishop elect becomes confirmed in the temporalities attached to his see.

Again, to show the fine line of demarcation which the law is supposed to have drawn between what is simony, and therefore illegal, and what is not, I will call to your recollection the well-known case of *Fox* v. *Bishop of Chester*. T. conveyed by bargain and sale the advowson of a rectory to E. F., the incumbent being to the knowledge of both parties at the point of death; but it did not appear that the purchase was made with a view to present any particular person, nor that the clerk who was presented had any knowledge of the transaction. It was held by the Court of King's Bench that this was not simony so as to authorise the bishop to reject the clerk: thus, although the incumbent was in a dying state, the sale was held to be legal. If, however, the presentee had been privy thereto, it would have been a simoniacal transaction, and, as such, illegal. It must be observed, that although this question arose out of the sale of an advowson, it was the first presentation under the right conveyed that was objected to. The sale of the advowson itself would have passed without inquiry, for advowsons stand in a more favoured position than next presentations.

Thus, the transfer of advowsons, whether by sale or purchase, is wholly unaffected by any legislative enactment: the only practically operative restraint arises when the benefice over which the right of advowson extends is vacant. The next presentation thereto will not then pass by the sale; this would not, however, prevent a clergyman from employing others to purchase the advowson for him, and causing himself to be presented upon the next vacancy caused either by the resignation or death of the incumbent. Again, a layman may purchase an advowson, or even a next presentation, take orders afterwards, and cause his own presentation; in either case the statute of Anne would be virtually violated, and the oath imposed by the canon would be the only impediment.

And lastly: to retain the restrictions on the acquisition of benefices, by prohibiting the sale of void advowsons, would tend to exclude from the priesthood the middle classes, from which have sprung some of our most intelligent and zealous divines, as well as many of the most eminent and earnest ministers of our church.

The conclusions, then, I would wish to draw from these remarks, are, 1st—That we attach too much importance to the circumstance of a benefice being void at the time of its sale—that nothing spiritual, so as to directly convey the cure of souls, passes on the transfer to the vendee, but that the temporalities alone pass from the seller to the buyer—that it is, in short, merely a matter of worldly concern. 2nd. That the law affecting the sale of benefices is full of anomalies and inconsistencies, and productive of evil rather than good both to the clergy and laity at large, and that the practical evils resulting from that law are strongly exemplified by the restrictions it will impose on the objects of the bill in question. To prevent the sale of the Crown Advowsons when they are full, will go far to restrict their sale. These advowsons must often become void by death or resignation, but when void the sale cannot take place; and unless there be a *stipulation* that the incumbent will resign in favour of the vendee, there will be little attraction for a purchaser.

And here it may be remarked that such a stipulation would not be legally binding on the incumbent—he may retain the benefice notwithstanding his promise to resign it: that is the legal view; what is the moral, is another question. It is true a bond conditional for resignation may be required and given, but that can only be done where there exists a connection, either by blood or marriage, between the clerk resigning and the person in whose favour the resignation is made. It cannot, for one moment, be supposed that the highest legal functionary in the kingdom, or any authority acting on behalf of the Crown, would present an infirm old man in order to fill a living with a view to its sale.

Again, one advantage resulting from the sale of the advowson when the church is vacant would be the immediate application of the sum realised towards the augmentation fund; whereas by permitting the sale only when the church is full, and its avoidance consequently remote and uncertain, the payment is deferred, and an intricate and cumbrous process has been necessarily resorted to, in order to meet the scruples of those who are purchasing a possession *in futuro*. The 5th clause of the amended bill, following the title "mode of payment of purchase money," fully exemplifies this. It is true that if the purchase of a vacant benefice were allowed it would not affect the sale of those that were full, and that some latitude of payment of the purchase money would, in that case, be necessary; but still where many of these advowsons would from time to time be vacant it seems desirable that the object of the bill should not be weakened by imposing any restriction on their sale.

Doubtless the objection may be raised that if the sale of Crown livings, whether vacant or full, is under this Act to be legalised, a distinction will be made between them and other church preferments. This raises the important question

whether the statutes of Elizabeth and Anne should not be repealed, and the sale of a benefice be wholly unfettered by any parliamentary enactment, and be placed on the same footing as that of any other real or chattel interest. It may be said, if that were done, the oath required from the purchasing clerk by the 40th canon would still be an impediment; but although the clergy might fail, as they did, in abrogating the canon prohibiting parents from being sponsors to their own children, still a proviso in the Act might render the requirement of the canon not compulsory, and thus leave the clerk who felt no scruples of conscience in buying a void living, with a view to its immediate possession, to do so. But the clause in question was confined to the livings scheduled in the bill, and as the purposes it seeks to effect would, as I conceive, be more fully and effectually secured by the retention of the clause empowering the sale of those advowsons, whether vacant or full, I would venture to ask the aid of this society in seeking its restoration as the bill passes through the House of Commons. As to the larger question—the repeal of the Acts against simony generally,—for that, perhaps, the public mind is not yet prepared; but I trust the day is not far distant when such a proposal will be gladly received both by clergy and laity.

The Test and Corporation Acts, once deemed the indispensible bulwarks of our church, no longer sully our statute-book. The restraints and disabilities imposed on papists, to protect our protestant faith, no longer give occasion to the disaffected to complain; and Judaism no longer bars the threshold of our Parliament house. Let us, then, in the same liberal and enlightened spirit in which those results were accomplished, approach this question, and strive to free the transfer of church preferment from the anomalies and restrictions which surround it.

THE SOLICITORS' BENEVOLENT ASSOCIATION.

The third annual festival of this association took place at the Freemasons' Tavern, on the 17th inst., Sir F. Kelly, Q.C., M.P., presiding as chairman.

There was a large attendance of the members of the profession.

Mr. Eiffe, the efficient secretary of the Association, read the report, which showed that during the last six months eight life, and twenty-three annual members had joined, making a total of 459 life, and 770 annual members. The receipts during the half-year had been £981 9s. 4d., of which £661 8s. 8d. had been added to the invested fund, bringing the total funded capital to £3,816 11s. Three per cent. consols, and £3,026 19s. 6d. India five per cents. The income applicable to relieving purposes was £255 per annum.

After the usual loyal toasts,

Serjt. PAYNE, in replying to the toast of "The Lord Chancellor, and her Majesty's judges," hoped at the next annual meeting their chairman would be then Lord Chancellor.

Mr. J. ANDERTON replied to the toast of "The Army, Navy, and Volunteers," in a humourous speech, and mentioned that in 1803 he was a volunteer, and guarded some French prisoners.

Mr. W. FIELD, in responding to the toast of "The Bar," regretted that he had not sooner been aware of the existence of the society, and stated that he had only heard of it the previous day. He promised, on behalf of the Bar, a crowded attendance at their next annual meeting.

The CHAIRMAN, in proposing the toast of the evening, assured the company of the pleasure and gratification he felt in meeting them on that occasion, and finding himself surrounded by a body of gentlemen belonging to a class with which he had for more than forty years had the honour of being associated, and to which he should be ungrateful if he did not add he owed all that he had and all that he was. They belonged to a class, perhaps he might say, the most important within the whole circle of society. We had, indeed, those mixed and diversified assemblies, the Lords and Commons of the realm, with their high and important duties to discharge; we had those professions to which we were all ready to assign the place of honour, and whose healths they had proposed and drunk with such enthusiasm that evening; but when they considered the peculiar position of that class of persons to whom they belonged, he thought he might say that while, on the one hand, it was the most generally useful to the rest of the community, it was the most absolutely and practically indispensable to us all. We might have a long period of peace, and be able to dispense with our army and navy, though we always rejoiced to see them amongst us; but there was scarcely any one man of mature years who had not frequent occasion to resort to and consult his solicitor. It mattered not whether we happened to be involved in disputes and difficulties concerning our interests, or were assailed in our private characters, the first step we must take, and the first person with whom we must communicate fully and freely was our solicitor. It was he who must point out the course we must take—it was he who must undertake the management and preservation of our interests. How important it was that such a body should be actuated by a sterling and solemn sense of duty. He felt that he need not say another word upon those general duties which they so ably discharged; but there was one duty to which it was necessary to refer—a duty imposed upon us all, more or less, in the several walks of life to which we might belong—the duty of extending to our fellow creatures that charity without which existence itself would be a blank or worse than a blank. He then eloquently enlarged upon the special objects of the association, and concluded by appealing to those present not only to give it their own support but to spread a knowledge of its existence and its purposes among their friends and associates.

The SECRETARY then read the stewards' lists of donations, which amounted to £700.

Mr. ANDERTON proposed the health of the chairman.

The CHAIRMAN in returning thanks, said it so happened the society was scarcely known to the judges, and he believed it was also unknown to the higher ranks of the Bar. Some steps must be taken to make it known, and he hoped the members would take every opportunity of so doing: he had never heard of the Society until asked to preside.

The healths of the Trustees of the Association, the Board of Directors, and Auditors, the Secretary, and the ladies, were then given, and the proceedings of the evening terminated.

THE LEGAL AND GENERAL DISCUSSION SOCIETY.

The second quarterly report of the secretary of this society (Mr. F. K. Munton) has just been issued. It states that during the quarter the society has held five meetings for debate on legal and general questions, and one meeting for discussion of points of practice. At the first five meetings the debates were upon the following subjects:—viz., Amendment of the Criminal Laws, Parliamentary Reform, Jurisdiction of Chancery Palatine of Lancaster, Executors' right to certain costs in a Chancery suit, and the Character and Policy of Oliver Cromwell.

The statistics of the society are such as, considering it has been established six months only, it may fairly be proud of. The number of members has been forty-seven. One new member only has been elected, but the non-accession of further strength may be attributed to the fact of the society's year being half advanced and the approach of the long vacation, during which, by the society's rules, the debates cannot be held. The attendance at the meetings has ranged from thirteen to twenty-five, the average number present being eighteen. The average duration of the meetings has been two hours and thirty minutes—the average number of speakers (excluding those who addressed the society on points of practice) seven. During the five debates four of the members have spoken four times; one, three times; eight, twice, and six, once. At one discussion the decision of the society was given by the chairman's casting vote, and on no debate has the society been unanimous.

COURT PAPERS.

Common Pleas.

This Court will, on Saturday the 20th, Monday the 22nd, Tuesday the 23rd, and Wednesday the 24th days of June inst., hold Sittings in Banco, and will proceed in disposing of the cases in the old new trial paper, in the special paper, and in the new trial paper of this Term.

The Court will also hold a Sitting in Banco on Monday, the 6th day of July next, to give judgment in the cases that will then be standing over for the consideration of the Court.

Exchequer of Pleas.

This Court will, on Monday, the 6th day of July next, hold a sitting, and will at such sitting proceed in giving judgment in cases then standing for judgment.

Summer Circuits, 1863.
(KEATING, J., will remain in Town.)

Midland.

COCKBURN, L.C.J., and WILLIAMS, J.

	Commission Days.			Last Days for full Notice of Trial.	
Oakham	Friday,	July	10	June	30
Northampton	Saturday,	July	11	July	1
Leicester and Borough	Wednesday,	July	15	July	4
Nottingham and Town	Monday,	July	20	July	10
Lincoln and City	Friday,	July	24	July	14
Derby	Wednesday,	July	29	July	18
Warwick	Monday,	Aug.	3	July	24

Western.

ERLE, L.C.J., and WILLES, J.

Winchester	Saturday,	July	11	July	1
Salisbury	Friday,	July	17	July	7
Dorchester	Wednesday,	July	22	July	11
Exeter and City	Saturday,	July	25	July	15
Bodmin	Saturday,	Aug.	1	July	22
Wells	Thursday,	Aug.	6	July	27
Bristol	Wednesday,	Aug.	12	Aug.	1

Norfolk.

POLLOCK, L.C.B., and WIGHTMAN, J.

Aylesbury	Wednesday,	July	15	July	4
Bedford	Saturday,	July	18	July	8
Huntingdon	Wednesday,	July	22	July	11
Cambridge	Friday,	July	24	July	14
Norwich and City	Tuesday,	July	28	July	18
Ipswich	Monday,	Aug.	3	July	24

Oxford.

MARTIN, B., and BYLES, J.

Abingdon	Thursday,	July	9	June	29
Oxford	Saturday,	July	11	July	1
Worcester and City	Wednesday,	July	15	July	4
Stafford	Monday,	July	20	July	10
Shrewsbury	Wednesday,	July	29	July	18
Hereford	Tuesday,	Aug.	4	July	25
Monmouth	Thursday,	Aug.	6	July	27
Gloucester and City	Monday,	Aug.	10	July	31

North Wales.

CROMPTON, J.

Newtown	Wednesday,	July	15	July	4
Dolgelly	Saturday,	July	18	July	8
Carnarvon	Tuesday,	July	21	July	11
Beaumaris	Friday,	July	24	July	14
Ruthin	Monday,	July	27	July	17
Mold	Thursday,	July	30	July	20
Chester and City	Saturday,	Aug.	1	July	22

South Wales.

WILDE, B.

Haverfordwest and Town	Wednesday,	July	1	June	20
Cardigan	Monday,	July	6	June	26
Carmarthen	Thursday,	July	9	June	29
Brecon	Monday,	July	13	July	3
Presteign	Thursday,	July	16	July	6
Cardiff	Saturday,	July	18	July	8
Chester and City	Saturday,	Aug.	1	July	22

Home.

BRAMWELL, B., and CHANNELL, B.

Hertford	Thursday,	July	9	June	29
Chelmsford	Tuesday,	July	14	July	4
Lewes	Monday,	July	20	July	10
Maidstone	Monday,	July	27	July	17
Croydon	Monday,	Aug.	3	July	24

Northern.

BLACKBURN, J., and MELLOR, J.

York and City	Tuesday,	July	7	June	27
Durham	Wednesday,	July	22	July	11
Newcastle and Town	Saturday,	July	25	July	15
Carlisle	Thursday,	July	30	July	20
Appleby	Monday,	Aug.	3	July	24
Lancaster	Wednesday,	Aug.	5	July	25
Liverpool	Saturday,	Aug.	8	July	29

PUBLIC COMPANIES.

BILLS IN PARLIAMENT.

The following bills for the formation of new lines of railway have been read a third time and passed in the House of Commons:—

BELFAST, HOLYHEAD, AND BANGOR.
BIRMINGHAM AND SUTTON COLEFIELD (EXTENSION).
DEVON VALLEY.
TENDRING HUNDRED.
WORCESTER, DEAN FOREST, AND MONMOUTH.

PROJECTED COMPANIES.

THE ADELAIDE (NORTH ARM) PORT AND RAILWAY EXTENSION AND LAND COMPANY, SOUTH AUSTRALIA, (LIMITED.)

Capital £400,000, in 20,000 shares of £20 each.

Solicitors—Messrs. Philips & Son, 11, Abchurch-lane, London.

This undertaking has for its object to afford increased accomodation to the shipping and trade of South Australia by the construction of extensive wharves, warehouses, &c., at the North Arm, near Adelaide. The project embraces also an extension of two miles of railway to complete the line already laid down by the government from the city of Adelaide to the North Arm, and a short line of four and a half miles to the Dry Creek station on the Great North and Murray River Railway, thereby effecting a saving of twelve miles of carriage between the great producing districts and the port of the colony.

THE GREAT INDIAN PENINSULA EXTENSION RAILWAY COMPANY (LIMITED).

Capital £1,000,000, in 50,000 shares of £20 each.

Solicitors—Messrs. White, Borritt, & White, 6, Whitehall-place.

THE ST. DAVID'S GOLD MINING COMPANY (LIMITED.)

Capital £100,000 in 40,000 shares of £2 10s. each.

The directors of this company have, in addition to the St David's Mining sett, purchased the sole right of exploring and searching for gold in the extensive alluvial deposits of the River Mawddach, and the outfall of its tributary streams, for a distance of about ten miles from the estuary, including the ancient deposits from the Clogau and other auriferous mountains of this district.

THE BIRMINGHAM DINING HALLS COMPANY (LIMITED).

Capital £5,000, in 250 shares of £20 each.

Solicitors, Messrs. Goodbehere & Bartleet, Birmingham.

The object of this company is to introduce into Birmingham the system of public dining halls so advantageously carried on in Glasgow.

The promoters being gentlemen interested in the welfare of the working classes, it is intended that the dividends shall not, in any case, exceed £5 per cent. on the paid up capital.

THE EGYPTIAN COMMERCIAL AND TRADING COMPANY (LIMITED).

Capital £2,000,000 in 100,000 shares of £20 each.

Solicitors, Messrs. Bircham, Dalrymple, Drake, & Ward, 46, Parliament-street, Westminster.

The object of the company is to devote special attention to the development of commerce with Upper Egypt, Nubia, the Soudan, and adjoining countries, as well as the borders of the Red Sea, and to establish trading relations with those districts, the enormous resources of which have been till now almost undeveloped.

BIRTHS, MARRIAGES, AND DEATHS.

BIRTHS.

BULLOCK—On June 16, at 4, Gloucester-terrace, Hyde-Park, the wife of Edward Bullock, Esq., Barrister-at-Law, of a daughter.

GREGSON—On June 14, at 28, Sussex-place, Regent's-park, the wife of Thomas Shuttleworth Gregson, Esq., of 8, Angel-court, Throgmorton-street, London, Solicitor, of a daughter.

MARCHANT—On June 7, at Port-vale, Hertford, the wife of John Marchant, jun., Esq., Solicitor, of a daughter.

NEISH—On June 14, at 21, Dawson place, Bayswater, W., the wife of William Neish, Esq., Barrister-at-Law, of a son.

MARRIAGES.

BOVELL—McCAUSLAND—On June 11, at St. Pancras Church, William Coleridge Bovell, Esq., S.C.C., Student of Gray's-inn, to Sarah Jane, eldest daughter of the late H. McCausland, Esq., Lieut. H.E.I.C. Navy.

JOHNSON—ALLEN—On June 11, at the parish church of Higham Ferrers, Northamptonshire, Robert Johnson, Esq., of Llanelly, Carmarthenshire, Solicitor, youngest son of Thomas Johnson, Esq., of Whittlesey, Cambridgeshire, to Charlotte, third daughter of the late Samuel Allen, Esq., of Higham Ferrers, Northamptonshire.

MARKBY—SEATON—On June 13, at St. Thomas's Church within the Liberty of the Rolls, Edward Gillam Markby, Esq., Solicitor, Rolls-chambers, 89, Chancery-lane, eldest surviving son of Frederick Markby Esq., of Hanton, Kent, to Alice Emily, eldest daughter of Harry Seaton Esq., of Brompton.

REED—TAYLER—On June 6, at the parish church, Streatham, Thomas Philus Haythorne Reed, Esq., of The Lodge, Streatham, Solicitor, youngest son of the late Henry Reed, Esq., Bridgwater, Solicitor, to Ellen, widow of the late Mr. Thomas Tayler, of The Willows, Mitcham, Surrey.

WATSON—RICHARDSON—On June 9, at the Friends' Meeting-house, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Robert Spence Watson, Esq., Solicitor, to Elizabeth, third daughter of Edward Richardson, Esq., of South Ashfield.

DEATHS.

BATTY—On Sunday last, at Redcar, in the 68th year of his age, Benjamin North Rockley Batty, Esq., formerly of Fenay Hall, near Huddersfield, one of her Majesty's Justices of the Peace for the West Riding of York.

GAMLEN—On April 2, at Southland, New Zealand, William Willis Gamlen, Esq., second son of Robert Gamlen, Esq., of Gray's-inn, and Hornsey, Middlesex, in the 23rd year of his age.

GROOM—On June 11, in his 70th year, Robert Groom, for the last 28 years the faithful and confidential clerk of Zachary Brooke, Esq., Solicitor, New Boswell-court, and after 54 years' service in the same business.

LYNCH—On June 14, at Cheltenham, Mrs. Theresa Lynch, widow of Andrew Henry Lynch, Esq., a Master in Chancery in ordinary, and younger daughter of Charles Butler, Esq., Q.C., in the 78th year of her age.

MINSTER—On June 9, in London, aged 26, Arthur, youngest son of Robert Harvey Minster, Esq., Solicitor, of the city of Coventry.

PETERS—On June 9, at Brockham, near Reigate, Surrey, George Peters, Esq., aged 57, son of the late James Peters, Esq., Solicitor, formerly of 18, New Millman-street, London.

REYNOLDS—On June 10, in Devonshire-street, Portland-place, Clare St. George Reynolds, youngest sister of the late Henry Revel Reynolds, Esq., Chief Commissioner of the Court for relief of Insolvent Debtors.

YOUNG—On June 14, Laura Thomasine, the eighth and beloved daughter of Robert Young, Esq., Solicitor, of 14, Delamere-terrace, Upper Westbourne-terrace, W., late of Battle, Sussex.

UNCLAIMED STOCK IN THE BANK OF ENGLAND.

The amount of Stock heretofore standing in the following Names will be transferred to the Parties claiming the same, unless other Claimants appear within Three Months:—

BARRY, REV. GAINS, and REV. JAMES BARRY, both late of Bath, Clerks, deceased. £116: 13: 4, £3 per Cent. reduced.—Claimed by Edward Barry, surviving executor of Rev. Gains Barry.

ESTATE EXCHANGE REPORT.

AT THE MART.

By Mr. F. A. MULLETT.

Leasehold residence, No. 5, Norfolk-crescent, Hyde-park, with stable, &c., in the rear; term 95 years from June 1840; ground rent £6 per annum; let at £206 15s. per annum.—Sold for £3,650.

By Mr. G. O. SWORDER.

Freehold estate "Westfield," Bishops Stortford, Hertford, comprising dwelling-house, outbuildings, and two Paddocks, containing altogether about 3 acres.—Sold for £1,840.

By Messrs. DANIEL SMITH, SON, & OAKLEY.

Freehold, "Hatchers" farm, Lockerby, Hants, consisting of 36a. 0r. 25p. arable land, with buildings thereon.—Sold for £1,300.

By Mr. G. R. NORLY.

Copyhold building land, Buckhurst Hill, Woodford, Essex, 38a. 1r. 19p.—Sold for £6,900.

By Mr. ALFRED SAVILL.

Freehold and copyhold, about 68 acres of grazing land, situate at Woodford-bridge, Essex.—Sold for £2,180.

By Messrs. CHINNOCK & GALSWORTHY.

Leasehold house, No. 10, Hereford-street, Oxford-street; term 36 years from March, 1837; ground rent, £63 per annum; let for £645 per annum.—Sold for £3,400.

By Mr. A. RICHARDSON.

Freehold dwelling-house, No. 56, London-wall, with workshops in the rear, let at £80 per annum.—Sold for £2,310.

Freehold, two houses and shops, Nos. 2 and 3, Holmes'-buildings, Bell-alley, London-wall, let for £77 per annum.—Sold for £1,390.

AT GARRAWAY'S.

By Mr. TAPLIN.

Leasehold houses and shops in Havelock-terrace, Price's-place, Railway-terrace, and Hainault-street, Ilford, Essex; estimated value, £362 per annum.—Sold for £2 850.

By Messrs TOPLIS & HARDING.

Copyhold, five residences, Woodford-green, Essex, with stables, gardens, &c.—Sold for £7,150.

Freehold residence, Woodford, Essex.—Sold for £1,200.

Freehold house and shop, Fuller's-row, Woodford.—Sold for £260.

Freehold, seven cottages, Nos. 2 to 8, Fuller's-row, Woodford.—Sold for £450.

Freehold, three cottages, Fuller's lane, Woodford.—Sold for £210.

Freehold land at Ditton, Bucks, about 27 acres.—Sold for £3,000.

Freehold building land at Datchett, Bucks, about 10 acres.—Sold for £1,260.

Leasehold, 20 cottages, York-buildings, Highgate.—Sold for £450.

By Messrs. F. & J. BELTON.

Leasehold, two residences, Nos. 5 and 6, Camden-road-villas, Camden-town; term 69 years from Christmas last; ground rent £9 per annum; estimated value £120 per annum.—Sold for £1,430.

Leasehold residence, No. 23, Berners-street, Oxford-street; term 25 years from Lady Day last; ground rent £15; let at £150.—Sold for £1,450.

Freehold, the "Queen's Head" public-house, corner of Great Bath-street and Little Warner-street, Clerkenwell.—Sold for £1,370.

Leasehold residence, No. 5, Bellina-villas, Junction-road, Kentish-town; term 22 years from September 1862; ground rent £10 10s. per annum; let at £65 per annum.—Sold for £420.

By Messrs. PHILLIPS & SON.

Leasehold manufactory, saw mills, workshops, and four houses, Helmet-row, and Norman's-buildings, Old-street, St. Luke's; term, 11 years from Lady Day last; ground rent £94 12s.; estimated value £270 per annum.—Sold for £855.

One freehold cottage, Town-wall-street, Dover; let at £21 per annum; also one dwelling house, No. 16, Liverpool-street, Dover; term 50 years from Lady Day last; ground rent £3 10s. per annum; let at £60 per annum.—Sold for £1,080.

Freehold residence, 16, London-street, Fitzroy-square; let at £50 per annum.—Sold for £750.

Leasehold, two houses and shops, Nos. 4 and 5, Sol's-row, Hampstead-road; also a dwelling, No. 15, Charlotte-street, Bedford-square.—Sold for £1,100.

LONDON GAZETTES.

Professional Partnerships Dissolved.

FRIDAY, June 12, 1863.

Stanton, Edward Dakin, & Thos Jones, Chorley, Lancaster, Attorneys and Solicitors (Stanton & Jones). By mutual consent. June 8.

Windings-up of Joint Stock Companies.

FRIDAY, June 12, 1863.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

Chesterfield New Dunston Colliery Company (Limited).—Petition for winding-up, presented June 5, will be heard before the Master of the Rolls on June 20. Prall & Nickinson, Chancery-lane, Solicitors for the petitioners.

TUESDAY, June 16, 1863.

UNLIMITED IN CHANCERY.

Mitre General Life Assurance Annuity and Family Endowment Association.—The Master of the Rolls will, on June 23 at 1, proceed to make a call on the several persons who have been settled on the list of contributories of this company for £10 per share.

Chatham Co-operative Industrial Society.—Creditors are required, on or before July 2, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, and the names and addresses of their solicitors, to J. Sawyer, 173, Fenchurch-st, Official Liquidator of this society. V. C. Wood.

Creditors under 22 & 23 Vict. cap. 35.

Last Day of Claim.

FRIDAY, June 12, 1863.

Caney, Thos, Red Lion, Charles-street, Long Acre, Victualler. July 10. Robinson, Ironmonger-lane.

Chamley, Elizabeth, Rock-park, Bebington, Chester, Widow. June 30. Peacock & Rogerson, Lpool.

Chamley, Wm, Rock-park, Bebington, Chester, Gent. June 30. Peacock & Rogerson, Lpool.

Constable, Rev. John, Middleham in Ringmer, Sussex. Aug 12. Phileux, Burwash, Sussex.

Cooper, John, Sheffield, Mason. July 24. Binney, Sheffield.

Goode, Chas, Clapham-park, Surrey, Silk Mercer. Aug 1. Drew & Wilkinson, Gt Queen-st, Westminster.

Hunt, Thos Maxwell, Oulton, nr Aylsham, Norfolk, Clerk in Orders. Sept 1. Bannister & Fache, John-st, Bedford-row.

Johnson, Peter, Bishop Auckland, Gent. July 6. Hepple & Proud, Bishop Auckland.

Jones, Luke, Bognor, Sussex, Clerk. July 11. Adcock, Cambridge.

Lugger, John Lloyd, Tregony, Cornwall, Clerk. Aug 1. Sole & Co, Aldermanbury, agents for Billing, Devonport.

Penny, John, Salford, Publican. Sept 1. Barrow, Manch.

Slaughter, Edw, Esq, Mansfield-st, Portland-pl, London, Solicitor. July 24. Slaughter & Cullington, Mansfield-st, Portland-pl.

Waller, Arthur, Myddleton-sq, Pentonville, Middlx, Esq. Aug 10. Walters & Son, Basinghall-street.

Walton, John, Winnington, Chester, Agent. June 30. Peacock & Rogerson, Lpool.

TUESDAY, June 16, 1863.

Beale, Wm Stephen, Lambourn, Berks, Carpenter. Sept 29. Ormond, Wantage, Berks.

Corby, Thos, Craven Villas, Ealing, Middlx, Victualler. Aug 1. Marson & Co, Anchor-ter, Bridge-st, Southwark.

Haines, John, Hazelden Villa, Cranbrook, Kent, Esq. Aug 1. Neve & Co, Cranbrook.

MacCabe, Chas, Wimpole-st, Cavendish-sq, Middx. July 25. Byrne, Walton-pl, Brompton.

Macdonald, Peter John, Lieut.-Col. in her Majesty's Fourth West Indian Regiment. Dec 31. Downs, Warwick-st, Charing-cross.

Rowden, Rev Geo Croke, D.C.L., The Chantry, Chichester. July 25. Routh & Co, Southampton-st, Bloomsbury.

Seaward, Mary Eliz, Harrington-sq, Hampstead-rd, Widow. July 13. Rogers, Manchester-buildings, Westminster.

Wood, Thos, Sherburn, York, Carver and Gilder. Aug 1. Hick & Jones, Leeds.

Creditors under Estates in Chancery.

Last Day of Proof.

FRIDAY, June 12, 1863.

Destman, Frances Ann, Catherine-st, St Georges in the East, Widow. June 27. Tealing v. Hooper, V. C. Wood.

Bone, Mary, Speenhamland, Berks, Spinster. July 9. White v. Deller, V. C. Stuart.

Eyles, Thos, Bath, Cabinet Maker. July 10. Eyles v. Eyles, M.R.

Hidson, Durant, Larkhall-lane, Clapham, Esq. June 25. Spires v. Fisher, V. C. Wood.

Perrott, Rev Thos, Walton Rectory, Derby, Clerk. July 6. Perrott v. Hamilton, V. C. Wood.

Richards, Ann, Branscombe, Devon, Widow. July 4. Prescott v. Otton, M.R.

TUESDAY, June 16, 1863.

Baynes, Wm, Anstwick, Clapham, York, Yeoman. July 6. Smith v. Baynes, M.R.

French, Benj, Bourne, Lincoln, Surgeon. July 13. Randall v. French, M.R.

Henderson, David, Gorwell street-road, Middx, Esq. July 13. Debie v. Debie, M.R.

Mackie, Wm, Leadenhall-st, Ship Broker. Oct 28. Mackie v. Mackie, M.R.

Myers, Hy, Francis-st, Tottenham-court-road, Surgeon. July 20. Smith v. Migotti, V.C. Stuart.

Robinson, Richd, Queen's-rd, Gloucester-gate, Regent's-park, Esq. July 6. Robinson *v.* Walsh, M.R.
Sewell, Arthur Hy Cole, Mount Aboo, Ragpootana, East Indies, Captain in the H. E. I. Co.'s Service. July 21. Sewell *v.* Prendergast, V. C. Stuart.
Turner, Hy, Northumberland Arms, Holland-st, Blackfriars-rd, Victualler. June 27. Walter *v.* Turner, V.C. Wood.

Assignments for Benefit of Creditors.

FRIDAY, June 12, 1863.

Richards, John Salisbury, Haseley, Warwick, Farmer. May 21. Morland & Godfrey, Abingdon.

TUESDAY, June 16, 1863.

Buckroyd, Wm, Leeds, Grocer. Feb 10. Simpson, Leeds.

Deeds registered pursuant to Bankruptcy Act, 1861.

FRIDAY, June 12, 1863.

Bean, Jas, Mumps, within Oldham, Ironmonger. June 6. Ass. Reg June 11.
Beckwith, Wm, Kingsland-rd, Builder. June 4. Ass. Reg June 11.
Bilby, Robt Wm, Malvern-rd, Dalston, Commercial Clerk. May 30. Conv. Reg June 9.
Blanchard, Ayscough, Kings Lynn, Grocer. May 25. Ass. Reg June 11.
Bray, Isaac, Lincoln, Wharfinger. May 23. Comp. Reg June 10.
Davies, Wm, Lower Cars, Stockport, Cotton Waste Dealer. May 14. Ass. Reg June 11.
Dean, Thos, Hulme, Porter. June 3. Ass. Reg June 10.
Dennis, Wm, Aldermanbury, Warehouseman. May 30. Ass. Reg June 9.
Dolby, David, Kates Hill, Dudley, Tallow Chandler. May 16. Comp. Reg June 10.
Dudman, Wm, Alexander-st, Paddington, Fishmonger. June 8. Comp. Reg June 12.
Dutton, John, Preston, Draper. May 14. Comp. Reg June 10.
Etté, Frank King, Upperthorpe, Sheffield, Merchant's Clerk. June 1. Conv. Reg June 11.
Garrett, Thos Smith, Llandudno, Carnarvon, Draper. May 19. Ass. Reg June 10.
Hague, Jonathan, Heckmondwike, York, General Dealer. May 19. Ass. Reg June 9.
Henderson, John Mankin, Sunderland, Builder. May 15. Conv. Reg June 11.
Heron, Saml, Hilston, Holderness, East Riding, York, Farmer. May 15. Ass. Reg June 11.
Hobgen, Gravatt Smith Ralph, Worthing, Attorney's Clerk. May 14. Conv. Reg June 10.
Kay, Hilton, Manch, India Rubber Dealer. May 18. Ass. Reg June 11.
Lockwood, Thos, Retford, Nottingham, Coal Merchant. May 13. Ass. Reg June 8.
Martin, Hy, Plymouth, Baker. June 1. Ass. Reg June 11.
Matthew, Saml, Lindsey, Suffolk, Farmer. May 16. Ass. Reg June 12.
McEnteer, Edward, Everett-ter, Victoria Dock-rd, Essex, Shipping Butcher. May 13. Conv. Reg June 9.
Morley, Fras Thos, & Thos Lowden, Goldsmith-st, London, Silk Warehousemen. May 18. Ass. Reg June 12.
Richardson, Wm, & Joseph Richardson, Hitchin, Hertford, Coach Builders. May 18. Comp. Reg June 10.
Ronaldson, Wm, & Robert Bolger Pownall, Great Tower-st, Merchants. June 9. Ass. Reg June 11.
Sewell, John, Morpeth, Northumberland, out of business. May 19. Comp. Reg June 10.
Shatwell, Geo, Macclesfield, Silk Manufacturer. June 4. Conv. Reg June 11.
Smith, Jabez, Hartlepool, Shoe Maker. May 19 Comp. Reg June 9.
Speakman, Hy, & Saml Quint, Fell-st, Wood-st, London, Umbrella Manufacturers. May 29. Ass. Reg June 11.
Taylor, Chas, Lincoln, Builder. May 7. Comp. Reg June 12.
Tipping, Geo, Macclesfield, Hat Manufacturer. May 20. Conv. Reg June 9.
Viner, Chas, & Joseph John Viner, Brighton, Plumbers. May 20. Comp. Reg June 12.
Watson, Chas Geo, Fletton, Huntingdon, M.D. June 3. Ass. Reg June 9.
Wells, Richd, Blackburn, Tea Dealer. May 13. Ass. Reg June 10.
Wilkes, Geo Alban, & John Wilkes, Durlaston, Druggists. May 14. Ass. Reg June 10.
Woods, John, Darlington, Plumber. May 19. Conv. Reg June 11.

TUESDAY, June 16, 1863.

Acres, Thos Poe, Hanley, Stafford, Draper. May 20. Comp. Reg June 12.
Brough, Thos, Cawton, York, Farmer. May 19. Ass. Reg June 15.
Butcher, Wm John, Cedar-ter, Walham-green, Fulham, Grocer. May 16. Comp. Reg June 13.
Byard, Wm Hy, Mill-pl, Limehouse, Barge Builder. May 18. Ass. Reg June 13.
Capes, Geo, Burton-upon-Trent, Draper. May 20. Ass. Reg June 15.
Davies, David Rees, Bridgend, Glamorgan, Tailor. May 23. Conv. Reg June 16.
Debon, Eugenie, John-st, Tottenham-court-road, Wood Carver. June 8. Ass. Reg June 16.
Evans, Evan Williams, & Robt Cook, Fulham-rd, Middx, Drapers. May 18. Ass. Reg June 15.
Francis, Joseph, Bedford, Builder. May 27. Ass. Reg June 12.
Freeman, Wm, jun, Norwich, Carver. June 12. Conv. Reg June 15.
Harvey, Hy Jas, Camborne, Cornwall, Saddler. May 27. Conv. Reg June 12.
Hedley, Alex. June 11. Ass. Reg June 16.
Hillyard, Rev Edward Augustus, Norwich. May 30. Conv. Reg June 10.
Holt, Thos, Old Accrington, Tinner. May 18. Ass. Reg June 15.
Humphreys, Hy, Manch, Shirt Maker. May 18. Comp. Reg June 15.
Huswell, Wm, Bradford-on-Avon, Tailor. May 26. Ass. Reg June 16.
Hurd, John Ambrose, Harthill, Gloucester, Draper. May 19. Conv. Reg June 15.
Laimon, Caleb, Tachbrook-st, Pimlico, Linen Draper. May 15. Comp. Reg June 12.
Lide, Wm Ely, Manch, Newspaper Agent. May 20. Ass. Reg June 15.
McGeorge, Jonas, Marylebone-st, Piccadilly, Stove and Range Maker. June 6. Conv. Reg June 13.
Mellon, Wm, Waterloo Dining Rooms, Birm. June 4. Comp. Reg June 15.
Moseley, Saml (otherwise Saml Wm Moseley), Neath, Glamorgan, Cabinet Maker. May 30. Conv. Reg June 15.
Ross, Edward Thos, Beverley, Auctioneer. May 16. Ass. Reg June 13.
Searle, Fredk, Whittlesey, Isle of Ely, Assistant Overseer. May 18. Ass. Reg June 15.
Stein, Andrew, Gt Queeen-st, Westminster, Parliamentary Solicitor. June 5. Ass. Reg June 12.
Stubley, Thos Stennett, Swineshead, Lincoln, Miller. May 22. Ass. Reg June 16.
Tobias, Margaret, Llanelly, Carmarthen, Spinster. May 18. Ass. Reg June 13.
Wright, Wm, Dudley, Victualler. June 12. Comp. Reg June 15.
Young, Archibald, & Patrick Halkett, Dunster-ct, Mincing-lane, Seed and Spice Merchants. April 29. Inspectorship. Reg June 13.

Bankrupts.

FRIDAY, June 12, 1863.

To Surrender in London.

Aungier, Wm, Montpelier-st, Montpelier-sq, Brompton, Tailor. Pet June 8. June 23 at 1. Hill, Basinghall-st.
Banks, Hy Stephen, Queen's-st, Mile-end New-town, Foreman to a Butcher. Pet June 8. June 25 at 1.30. Hill, Basinghall-st.
Barns, Joseph, Staverton-row, Walworth-rd, Newington, Poulterer. Pet June 9. June 30 at 11. Heathfield, Lincoln's-inn-fields.
Bilton, John, Gough-st, Gray's-inn-lane, Middx, out of business. Pet June 8 (for pau). June 23 at 2. Aldridge.
Bowmer, Chas, Devonshire-grove, Old Kent-rd, Comm Agent. Pet June 8. June 25 at 2. Wyatt, Clement's-lane, Lombard-st.
Bugbee, Geo, Vauxhall-walk, Lambeth, Carpenter. Pet June 8. June 23 at 1. Wetherfield, Moorgate-st.
Callow, John, St Andrew's-rd, Horsemonger-lane, Assistant to a Miller. Pet June 9 (for pau). June 30 at 11. Aldridge.
Collingwood, Wm Alfred, Basinghall-st, Accountant's Clerk. Pet June 6. June 23 at 1. Mardon, Newgate-st.
Cooper, Thos Poolly, Sudely-st, Islington, Clerk to an Engineer. Pet June 9. June 25 at 12. Lewis & Lewis, Ely-pl.
Davies, John, Lambs Conduit-st, Middx, Compositor. Pet June 8. June 23 at 1. Waldron, Lambs Conduit-st.
Dudley, Joseph, sen, Cottage-row, Bermondsey-wall, Surrey, out of business. Pet June 8. June 23 at 12. Silvester, Gt Dover-st.
Gardiner, John, Queen-st, Golden-sq, Middx, Envelope Stamper. Pet June 9. June 23 at 1. Lewis, Gt Marlboro'-st.
Glover, Jas, James-st, Paddington, Comm Agent. Pet June 8 (for pau). June 23 at 2. Aldridge.
Hall, Thos, David-st, George-st, New Kent-rd, Carpenter. Pet June 9 (for pau). June 23 at 2. Aldridge.
Hunt, John, sen, Freston, Suffolk, Builder. Pet June 9. June 23 at 3. Reed, Gresham-st.
Jeans, Joseph Hy, Southampton, Medical Practitioner. Pet June 9. June 23 at 3. Stocken, Cornhill.
Jonas, Theodor Samson, Millman-row, King's-rd, Chelsea, Comm Agent. Pet June 6 (for pau). June 23 at 2. Aldridge.
Lee, Barnard, Park-st, Islington, Attorney's Clerk. Pet June 8. June 23 at 1. Ilderton, Basinghall-st.
Linsey, Thos Busby, Railway-pl, Shoreditch, Silversmith. Pet June 10. June 25 at 2. King, Queen-st, Cheapside.
Massarenti, Gaetano Nicolo Vincenzo Maria, Frith-st, Soho, Comm Agent. Pet June 6 (for pau). June 23 at 2. Aldridge.
Masterman, Hy Saml, Warner-pl, Hackney-rd, Hearth Rug Manufacturer. Pet June 8. June 23 at 2. Wells, Moorgate-st.
Nash, Ebenezer Michael, Strand, Tobacconist. Pet June 10. June 30 at 2. Schultz, Dyer's-buildings, Holborn.
Perkins, John, Thomas-st, Newington-causeway, Cheesemonger. Pet June 10. June 30 at 1. Marshall, Lincoln's-inn-fields.
Pick, Thos, Union-row, Clapham, out of employ. Pet June 9 (for pau). June 22 at 1. Aldridge.
Pilbeam, Fredk, Tamworth-rd, Croydon, Surrey, Builder. Pet June 5. June 23 at 12. Tayloe, Scott's-yd, Bush-lane.
Saltmer, Fredk Graham, Cleveland-st, Fitzroy-sq, Middx, Boot Maker. Pet June 8. June 22 at 12. Stopher & Co, Coleman-st.
Shortland, Thos, Floore, nr Weedon, Northampton, Tailor. Pet June 9. June 30 at 11. Lottus & Young, New-inn, Strand, agents for Shoosmith, Northampton.
Simon, Edouard, Park-walk, Chelsea, Comm Agent. Pet June 6 (for pau). June 23 at 2. Aldridge.
Smith, Chas Jesse, Houndsditch, Oil and Colourman. Pet June 8. June 22 at 3. Adams, Walbrook.
Smith, John Bell, Regent-st, Pall Mall, Artist. Pet June 10. June 30 at 11. Mason, Maddox-st, Regent-st.
Stevens, John, St John's-wood-ter, Regent's pk, Clerk to the N. W. R. Co. Pet June 11. June 29 at 12. Hill, Basinghall-st.
Suter, Chas, High-st, Borough, Dealer in Furniture. Pet June 10. June 30 at 11. Marshall & Son, Hatton-garden.
Terrington, Robt, Stanhoe, Norfolk, Cordwainer. Pet June 8. June 22 at 11. Lawrance & Co, Old Jewry-chambers.
Wainwright, Jas, King David-lane, Shadwell, Bass Broom Maker. Pet June 10. June 22 at 12. Juckes, Basinghall-st.
Weiss, Martin, King William-st, Strand, Accoucheur and Medical Agent. Pet June 9 (for pau). June 22 at 12. Aldridge.
Wilson, Thos Norris, Wellesley-ter, Anglesea-rd, Woolwich, Dock Clerk. Pet June 9. June 23 at 1. Heathfield, Lincoln's-inn-fields.

To Surrender in the Country.

Arrowsmith, Thos, Stafford, Shoe Manufacturer. Pet June 8. Stafford, June 29 at 10. Bowen, Stafford.
Barnes, Alex, Sheffield, Cutlery Manufacturer. Pet June 9. Sheffield, June 27 at 10. Unwin, Sheffield.
Beall, Wm, jun, Holmsdale, nr Reigate, Butcher. Pet June 8. Reigate, June 22 at 1. Silvester, Gt Dover-st, Southwark.
Capes, Gabriel Brittain, Burton-on-Trent, Engineer. Pet June 8. Birm, June 22 at 12. Barber, Birm.
Clemmet, Jas, jun, Stockton-on-Tees, Attorney-at-Law. Pet June 6. Newcastle-upon-Tyne, June 30 at 12. Griffith & Crighton, Newcastle-on-Tyne.
Cooke, Wm, Newbold Verdon, Leicester, Grocer. Pet June 9. Birm, June 26 at 12. Cowdell & Bramah, Market Bosworth, and James & Co, Birm.

Craig, Robt, jun, Lpool, Victualler. Pet June 9. Lpool, June 24 at 11. Pemberton, Lpool.
Cumberland, Wm. Nottingham, Maltster. Pet June 11. Nottingham, July 22 at 11. Preston, Nottingham.
Dumbrill, John Neville, Eastbourne, out of business. Pet June 2 (for pau). Lewes, June 18 at 11. Goodman, Brighton.
Field, Joseph, Kirkburton, York, General-shop Keeper. Pet June 3. Huddersfield, July 2 at 10. Freeman, Huddersfield.
Fisher, Joe, Golcar, nr Huddersfield, Cloth Dresser. Adj May 27. Huddersfield, July 2 at 10. Mason, York.
Fox, Michael John, Rotherham, York. Cordwainer. Pet June 9. Rotherham, June 25 at 11. Hirst, Rotherham.
Gelderd, Robt, Girlington in Manningham, York, Carter. Pet May 29. Bradford, July 22 at 10.30. Hutchinson, Bradford.
Gibson, Thos, Roadway, Bedworth, Warwick, Sawyer. Pet June 10. Nuneaton, June 26 at 1. Smallbone, Coventry.
Goldsmith, Miriam, Portslade, Sussex, Milliner. Pet June 9. Brighton, June 30 at 11. Goodman, Brighton.
Hill, Elijah, North Nibley, Gloucester, Haulier. Pet June 8. Dursley, June 22 at 11. Clutterbuck, Stroud.
Hodges, Thos, jun, Hill Farm, Huddington, Worcester, Hallier. Pet June 8. Droitwich, June 29 at 12. Bentley, Worcester.
Howard, Anna, Southampton, Optician. Pet May 22. Southampton, June 22 at 12. Mackey, Southampton.
Inman, Isaac, Sheffield, Commercial Traveller. Pet June 9. Sheffield, June 27 at 10. Unwin, Sheffield.
Jackson, Chas, & Chas Saunders, Oldham, Coach Builders. Pet June 1. Manch, June 24 at 11. Marriott, Manch.
Janes, Ebenezer, Milbrook, Southampton, Builder. Pet June 10. Southampton, July 18 at 12. Mackey, Southampton.
Kershaw, Jas, Rochdale, Lancaster, Woollen Weaver. Pet June 6. Rochdale, June 24 at 11. Standring, Rochdale.
Lord, John, Halifax, Accountant. Pet June 11. Leeds, July 2 at 11. Hill, Halifax, and Bond & Barwick, Leeds.
Lloyd, Thos, Birm, Timber Merchant. Pet June 9. Birm, July 3 at 12. Hodgson & Co, Birm.
Pearson, Wm, Whaplode, Lincoln, Shoe Maker. Pet June 9. Holbeach, June 24 at 10. Bonner & Calthrop, Spalding.
Pearson, Wm Hy, Kingston-upon-Hull, Slater. Pet June 10. Kingston-upon-Hull, June 24 at 12. Spurr & Richardson, Hull.
Powell, John, Stanton Lacy, Salop, Farm Bailiff. Pet May 30. Shrewsbury, June 23 at 12. Chandler, Shrewsbury.
Rafter, Hy, Coventry, Artist. Pet June 10. Birm, June 29 at 12. Ivens, Leamington.
Reeve, Thos, Coleshill, Warwick, Wheelwright. Pet June 9. Birm, June 29 at 12. Hodgson & Co, Birm.
Rice, Joseph, Cheadle, Chester, Brick Maker. Pet June 10. Manch, June 25 at 11. Boote, Manch.
Shaw, Jas, Manch, Provision Dealer. Pet June 5. Manch, June 23 at 12. Cobbett & Wheeler, Manch.
Shepley, Chas, Knowles-lane, nr Oldham, Assistant to a Cattle Dealer. Pet June 9. Ashton-under-Lyne, July 9 at 12. Rawlinson, Manch.
Smith, Joseph, Birm, Manufacturer of Electro-plated Goods. Pet June 8. Birm, July 6 at 10. Parry, Birm.
Steinthal, Joseph, Abbey Hey, Gorton, Lancaster, Manufacturing Chemist. Pet June 3. Manch, July 6 at 12. Slater, Manch.
Wall, Edward, Birm, Boot Maker. Pet May 12 (for pau). Birm, July 6 at 10.
Walker, Wm, Over, Chester, Agent. Pet June 11. Lpool, July 2 at 11. Cheshire, Northwich, Cheshire.
Westley, Matilda Mary, Derby, Milliner. Pet June 9. Derby, June 25 at 12. Leech, Derby.
White, Joseph, Wells, Somerset, Butcher. Pet June 9. Wells, June 23 at 11. Reed, Bridgwater.
Williams, Geo, Brickfields, Maidenhead, Blacksmith. Pet June 8. June 23 at 11. Voules, Windsor.

TUESDAY, June 16, 1863.

To surrender in London.

Armstrong, Fredk, Priory, Fratton, New Southsea, Hants, Clerk in Portsmouth Dockyard. Pet June 8. June 30 at 1. Linklaters & Hackwood, Walbrook.
Bayliss, John, Arthur-grove, Kentish Town, out of business. Pet June 13. June 29 at 2. Doyle, Verulam-buildings, Gray's-inn.
Berner, John Casimier, Harp-alley, Farringdon-st, Baker. Pet June 12. June 30 at 1. Fossick, Bloomfield-st.
Bew, Albert Geo, Fulham-rd, West Brompton, Coffee-house Keeper. Pet June 11. June 30 at 12. Hill, Basinghall-st.
Bourner, Chas (and not Bowmer, as previously advertised in the Gazette of the 12th of June last).
Brown, Edward, Charles-pl, Ferdinand-st, Hampstead-rd, Mason. Pet June 11. June 30 at 11. Hill, Basinghall-st.
Carter, Wm Thos, South-cottages, Wellington-rd, North-end, Fulham, Commission Traveller. Pet June 13. June 30 at 12. Buchanan, Basinghall-st.
Chapman, John Mayhew, Denbigh-pl, Pimlico, Clerk. Pet June 12. June 30 at 1. Gold & Son, Whitefriars-st.
Cull, Thos, East Farleigh, Kent, Farmer. Pet June 11. June 30 at 12. Church & Co, Southampton-buildings.
Flewellen, John, Bermondsey-st, out of employ. Pet June 11 (for pau). June 30 at 1. Aldridge.
Gardner, Thos, Brunswick-st, Blackwall, Butcher. Pet May 27. June 29 at 2. Mass, Martin's-lane, Cannon-st.
Gocher, Jas, Low Leyton, out of business. Pet June 11. June 29 at 1. Webb, Lincoln's-inn-fields.
Groome, Joseph Partridge, Pentonville-rd, Islington, Builder. Pet June 11 (for pau). June 30 at 2. Aldridge.
Hayman, Stephen, Spencer-ter, Lower-rd, Islington, out of business. Pet June 9 (for pau). June 29 at 1. Aldridge.
Hohne, Hy Fredk, Upper-st, Islington, Master Mariner. Pet June 11. June 30 at 2. Wetherfield, Moorgate-st.
Johnson, Jas, Wheathamstead, Hertford, Victualler. Pet June 11. June 30 at 11. Lofty & Co, King-st, Cheapside, and Annesly, St Albans.
Jones, Wm Hy, Piccadilly, House Decorator. Pet June 12. June 30 at 12. Linklaters & Hackwood, Walbrook.
Kenney, Jas Nicholas, Catherine-st, Strand, Clerk in the Post Office. Pet June 10. June 30 at 12. Walter & Meejen, Southampton-st, Bloomsbury.
Klindworth, Carl Ludwig, Manchester-st, Middlx, Professor of Music. Pet June 9. June 29 at 11. Appleton, Crosby-sq.
Louys, Jos, Gt Winchester-st, London, Comm Agent. Pet June 11 (for pau). June 29 at 2. Aldridge.
Meteyard, Alfred, York, Comm Traveller. Pet June 12. June 29 at 2. Wood, Coleman-st.
Michell, Geo Monck Berkeley, Leadenhall-st, Examiner of Military Stores. Pet June 16. June 29 at 11. Wetherfield, Moorgate-st.
Newman, John, Shirleywick-pl, Pomeroy-st, Old Kent-rd, Builder. Pet June 12. June 29 at 2. Cooper, Charing-cross.
Osborn, Jos, King's-rd, Bedford-row, Middlx, Cowkeeper. Pet June 11. June 30 at 12. Ody, Trinity-st, Southwark.
Page, John, Mount-row, Liverpool-rd, Islington, Confectioner. Pet June 11 (for pau). June 29 at 11. Aldridge.
Shipwright, Rbt, Randolph-st, Camden Town, Working Jeweller. Pet June 11. June 29 at 12. Drake, Gresham-st.
Tassell, Thos, Abbey-pl, Abbey-wood, Erith, Victualler. Pet June 12. June 30 at 12. Murrough, Warwick-ct, Gray's-inn.
Thomas, Saml, Mornington-rd, New Cross, Assistant to a Hosier. Pet June 13. June 29 at 11. Marden, Newgate-st.
Turner, Jas, New Cross-rd, New Cross, Baker. Pet June 10. June 30 at 12. Stocken, Cornhill.
Waring, Emma Hastings Scott, Westbourne-park-rd, Bayswater, Spinster. Pet June 11. June 30 at 11. Church & Co, Southampton-bldgs.
West, Hy, Leather-lane, out of business. Pet June 8 (for pau). June 30 at 12. Aldridge.
Woods, Rchd Lennox, Warwick-st, Eccleston sq, Pimlico, Clerk in a Public Office. Pet June 12. June 30 at 12. Levy, Surrey-st, Strand.

To Surrender in the Country.

Alderaley, Jno, Leeds, Beerseller. Pet June 13. Leeds, July 2 at 11. Naylor, Leeds.
Barlow, Jas, Bury, Cart Sheet Maker. Pet June 10. Bury, July 2 at 12. Anderton, Bury.
Bayley, Jas, and Elizabeth Bayley, Wilmslow, Chester, Bricklayer. Pet June 5. Oldham, July 9 at 12. Lowe, Oldham.
Brogan, Jno, Stretford New-rd, Hulme, Painter and Paper Hanger. Pet June 11. Manch, June 30 at 11. Atherton, Manch.
Brown, Hy Hime, St David, Exeter, Clay Merchant. Pet June 13. Exeter, July 3 at 11. Daw & Son, Exeter.
Browne, Jno, Southsea, Builder. Pet June 12. Portsmouth, June 26 at 11. Paffard, Portsea.
Burgess, Thos, Lawford, Essex, Farrier. Pet May 9. Colchester, July 27 at 11.30. Jones, Colchester.
England, Stephen, Featherstall, Rochdale, Builder. Pet June 15. Rochdale, July 1 at 11. Standring, Rochdale.
Forster, Saml, Leek, Boot Maker. Pet June 10. Leek, July 2 at 11. Tennant, Hanley.
Gilchrist, Jno, Millbridge, York, Manufacturing Chemist. Pet June 12. Leeds, June 29 at 11. Iveson, Heckmondwike, and Bond & Barwick, Leeds.
Gledhill, Job Edw, Rochdale, Plumber. Pet June 13. Manch, July 7 at 12. Standring, Rochdale.
Guile, Rchd Turner, Chichester, Butcher. Pet June 11. Chichester, July 1 at 10. Goodman, Brighton.
Hart, Adam Clark, Glamford Briggs, Lincoln, Millwright. Pet June 13. Kingston-upon-Hull, July 1 at 12. Hett & Co, Brigg.
Hedges, Joseph, Burslem, Stafford, Bandmaster. Pet June 12. Hanley, June 27 at 12. Sutton, Burslem.
Hogg, Wm, Cliburn, Westmoreland, Livery Servant. Pet June 12. Penrith, June 27 at 10. Cant, Penrith.
Lancaster, Jno, Northwich, Chester, Tea Dealer. Pet June 12. Northwich, July 4 at 11. Dunstan, Northwich.
Locker, Saml, Longton, Stoke-upon-Trent, Labourer. Pet May 30. Stoke-upon-Trent, June 26 at 11. Tennant, Hanley.
McLaughlin, Jno, Kingston-upon-Hull, Auctioneer. Pet June 8. Hull, June 22 at 11. Pettingell, Hull.
Morris, Wm Cypria, Neath, Glamorgan, Lime Burner. Pet June 12. Bristol, June 26 at 11. Cuthbertson & Kempthorne, Neath, Bevan & Co, Bristol.
O'Hare, Geo, Warrengate, Wakefield, Hawker. Pet June 12. Wakefield, June 30 at 11. Gill, Wakefield.
Ormerod, Jno, Bowling, Bradford, Warehousman. Pet June 12. Bradford, July 22 at 10.30. Terry & Watson, Bradford.
Patton, Zachariah Rogers, Tollesbunt D'Arcy, Essex, Dealer in Pigs. Adj June 11. Chelmsford, June 25 at 10.
Powell, Jno, Abergavenny, Coal Merchant. Pet June 12. Bristol, June 26 at 11. Bevan & Co, Bristol.
Runnalls, Richd, Copperhouse, Phillack, Cornwall, Butcher. Pet May 14. Redruth, June 27 at 11.
Ryder, Robt, Bury, Provision Dealer. Pet June 10. Bury, July 2 at 11. Anderton, Bury.
Stelfox, John, Baxenden, nr Accrington, Cotton Spinner. Pet June 12. Manch, June 30 at 12. Dean & Dean, Blackburn, and Cobbett & Wheeler, Manch.
Stuckey, Benj, Kingston Seymour, Somerset, Farmer. Pet June 13. Bristol, July 3 at 12. Hill.
Waithman, Anthony Geo, Leeds, Cloth Manager. Pet June 11. Leeds, June 29 at 11. Upton & Yewdall, Leeds.
Wardle, Thos, Redland, Bristol, Ironmonger. Pet June 13. Bristol, June 3 at 12. King & Plumber.

BANKRUPTCIES ANNULLED.

FRIDAY, June 12, 1863.

Abell, Thos Hy, Okehampton, Devon, Grocer. Feb 20.
Kay, Hilton, Manch, India Rubber Dealer. June 10.

TUESDAY, June 16, 1863.

Eldrid, Edw Hards, Horsham, Sussex, Veterinary Surgeon. May 25.
Shaw, Jas, Scholes, York, Cotton Spinner. June 11.
Young, Geo Rbt, London-rd, Southwark, Manufacturer of Fancy Wood and Gilt Mouldings. June 11.

BANKRUPTCIES IN IRELAND.

Burnell, Hy Geo, Belfast, Seed Merchant. To surr June 29 and July 10.
Fennell, Jno, Booterstown, Dublin, Butcher. To surr June 23 and July 7.
Monahan, Christopher, & Jno Monahan, Dublin, Wholesale Grocers. To surr June 23 and July 10.

In Chancery: "Whitehead and others v. Lynes and others." Stidolph v. Dickinson."—Important Investment for Capitalists or Trustees in valuable Freehold and Leasehold Property, situate in the very heart of the city of London.

MESSRS. EDWIN FOX & BOUSFIELD have been favoured with instructions to SELL by AUCTION, at the MART, on WEDNESDAY, JUNE 24, at TWELVE, in Two Lots, pursuant to certain orders made in the above causes, and with the approbation of his Honour the Master of the Rolls, the judge to whose court the said causes are attached, an exceedingly valuable ESTATE (the tenure of which is for the most part Freehold and small part Leasehold) comprehending a portion of the commanding range of buildings at the eastern extremity of Gresham street, comprising the two commodious professional residences numbered 24, 24a, and 25, immediately facing the Old Jewry, a situation that will always maintain a pre-eminent position for business purposes from its contiguity to the Bank of England, the Royal Exchange, and other important central resorts of commercial enterprise, and which is a guarantee that its rental value will yearly increase. Nos. 24 and 24a contain 18 rooms on the upper floors; on the ground floor, a noble suite of four or five offices, capable of considerable improvement; and a roomy basement. Let to yearly tenants of high standing at nominal rents, and fo the value of £800 per annum. No. 25 contains 16 rooms, exclusive of the basement, and is occupied by Messrs. Beadell. It is let on lease, expiring in 1871, at a ground rent of £53 13s., and is of the estimated value of about £400 a year.

Particulars, with plans, may be obtained of Mr. T. BROWNING, Solicitor, 1, Hatton-court, Threadneedle-street; of Messrs. TORR, JANEWAY, & TAGART, Solicitors, Bedford-row; of Mr. BOWER, Solicitor, Tokenhouse-yard; of Messrs. FRESHFIELDS & NEWMAN, Solicitors, Bank-buildings; of Messrs. BLAKE & SNOW, Solicitors, College-hill, Cannon-street West; of Mr. BOWKER, Solicitor, 1, Gray's-inn-square; of Messrs. BENNET, DAWSON, & THORNHILL, Solicitors, Lincoln's-inn, New-square; of Mr. BURRELL, Solicitor, 43, Lincoln's-inn-fields; of Mr. MOXON, Solicitor, 53, Lincoln's-inn-fields; and of Messrs. EDWIN FOX & BOUSFIELD, 41, Coleman-street, Bank, E.C.

In Chancery: "Whitehead and others v. Lynes and others;" "Stidolph v. Dickinson."—Compact and valuable Freehold and Copyhold Property; comprising a spacious residence, with grounds, and about 32 acres of capital building land, known as the Tanners'-hall Estate, Edmonton.

MESSRS. EDWIN FOX & BOUSFIELD have been favoured with instructions to SELL by AUCTION, at the MART, on WEDNESDAY, JUNE 24, at TWELVE, in Four Lots (pursuant to certain orders made in the above causes, and with the approbation of His Honour the Master of the Rolls, the judge to whose court the said causes are attached), a valuable FREEHOLD and COPYHOLD ESTATE, situate at Tanners'-end, near the town of Edmonton, on the road to Southgate: comprising a spacious and substantially built family residence, distinguished as Tanners'-hall, standing at an agreeable remove from the road, approached by a carriage drive, and surrounded by tastefully laid-Out pleasure grounds and meadows to the extent of 32 acres, with compact and well placed outbuildings. The house contains 10 large chambers, principal and secondary staircases, noble entrance-hall, 40ft. by 21, richly decorated spacious dining room, elegant drawing room, library, and domestic offices. The land possesses commanding frontages to existing roads over 3,000 feet in extent. As a residential property it is rendered singularly attractive on account of its very agreeable and convenient situation near the railway station, and only eight miles from the city and west-end, while to the capitalists it offers a first-class investment, possessing unusual facilities for the successful development of building operations. The residence and land are now let at only nominal rents, on yearly tenancies, so that early possession can be had.

Particulars, with plans, may be had of Mr. T. BROWNING, Solicitor, 1, Hatton-court, Threadneedle-street; of Messrs. TORR, JANEWAY, & TAGART, Solicitors, Bedford-row; of Mr. BOWER, Solicitor, Tokenhouse-yard; of Messrs. FRESHFIELDS & NEWMAN, Solicitors, Bank-buildings; of Messrs. BLAKE & SNOW, Solicitors, College-hill, Cannon-street West; of Mr. BOWKER, Solicitor, 1, Gray's-inn-square; of Messrs. BENNET, DAWSON, & THORNHILL, Solicitors, Lincoln's-inn, New-square; of Mr. BURRELL, Solicitor, 43, Lincoln's-inn-fields; of Mr. MOXON, Solicitor, 53, Lincoln's-inn-fields; and of Messrs. EDWIN FOX & BOUSFIELD, 41, Coleman-street, Bank, E.C.

MESSRS. E. & H. LUMLEY, AUCTIONEERS and ESTATE AGENTS, No. 67, Chancery-lane, London, beg to call the attention of all interested in the Buying, Selling, Renting, or Purchasing of Land and Houses, to their "FREE PROPERTY REGISTER," published on the first day of every month, and containing the particulars of many hundred Landed Estates—Farms, Town and Country Residences, Freehold and Leasehold Investments, and Properties generally for Disposal.

OWNERS WISHING to SELL or LET will, in most instances, find an immediate customer by forwarding the particulars to Messrs. LUMLEY. No charge is incurred unless a tenant or purchaser is introduced, and then but a very moderate commission.

PERSONS WISHING to RENT or PURCHASE should consult the "REGISTER," which at all times offers an immense selection of properties, and may be obtained, gratis, at the principal Railway Book Stalls, and at the

AUCTION and ESTATE OFFICES, 67, Chancery-lane, London.

SLACK'S SILVER ELECTRO PLATE is a coating of pure Silver over Nickel. A combination of two metals possessing such valuable properties renders it in appearance and wear equa to Sterling Silver.

	Fiddle Pattern.		Thread.		King's.	
	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.		£ s. d.	
Table Forks, per doz.....	1 10 0	and 1 18 0	2 8 0		3 0 0	
Dessert ditto	1 0 0	and 1 10 0	1 15 0		2 2 0	
Table Spoons	1 10 0	and 1 18 0	2 8 0		3 0 0	
Dessert ditto	1 0 0	and 1 10 0	1 15 0		2 2 0	
Tea Spoons	0 12 0	and 0 18 0	1 3 6		1 10 0	

Every Article for the Table as in Silver.—A Sample Tea Spoon forwarded on receipt of 20 stamps.

CEYLON COMPANY (LIMITED).
Subscribed Capital, £350,000.
DIRECTORS.

Lawford Acland, Esq., *Chairman.*	Duncan James Kay, Esq.
Sir James D. H. Elphinstone, Bart., M.P.	Stephen P. Kennard, Esq.
	Patrick F. Robertson, Esq.
Harry George Gordon, Esq.	Robert Smith, Esq.
George Ireland, Esq.	Sir S. Villiers Surtees, K.B.

Debentures at 5, 5½, and 6 per Cent.

The Directors of the CEYLON COMPANY LIMITED, being authorised by a resolution of the shareholders, at the General Meeting of the company, held in London on the 4th day of April, 1863, to borrow a sum of money not exceeding the unpaid portion of their Subscribed Capital, are prepared to issue debentures for one, three, and five years, at 5, 5½, and 6 per Cent. respectively, and for longer periods, as may be specially arranged.

The directors are also prepared to invest for constituents, at Colonial rates, Money on Mortgage in Ceylon and Mauritius, either with or without their guarantee, as may be arranged.

Applications for particulars to be made at the office of the company, No. 12, Old Broad-street. By order,

JOHN ANDERSON, Secretary.

NEW ZEALAND TRUST AND LOAN COMPANY, LIMITED.
TRUSTEES.
Robert Brooks, Esq., M.P. | G. Grenfell Glyn, Esq., M.P.
J. J. Cummins, Esq.
DIRECTORS.

Sir Charles Clifford.	F. G. Dalgety, Esq.
Sir J. Henry Pelly, Bart.	H. Selfe Selfe, Esq.
Capt. H. Carr Glyn, R.N.	R. A. Brooks, Esq.

BANKERS.
Messrs. Glyn, Mills, & Co.
BROKERS.
Messrs. Mullens, Marshall, & Co.
Messrs. Brunton & Son.

The Directors are prepared to issue Debentures of £100 and upwards, for periods of three to seven years, bearing interest at 5 per cent. per annum, payable half-yearly, at their Bankers, on 1st January and 1st July, or 1st April and 1st October, by Coupon. These Debentures are secured by the uncalled balance of the subscribed Capital of the Company, of equivalent or greater amount. They will also form a first charge upon real and other property in New Zealand, on which it is the business of the Company to grant Loans by way of Mortgage.

Application may be made at the Offices of the Company, or of the Brokers, as above. By Order of the Board,

THOS. D. SAUNDERS, Secretary.

31, New Broad-street, London, E.C.

Just published, price 1s. 6d., post free,

HANDY BOOK on the DIMINUTION of the POOR RATES. By STANDISH G. GRADY, Recorder of Gravesend.

"The importance of this question is becoming, and will become every day, more grave. The difficulty must be grappled with, and we think the learned Recorder has contributed some help towards its solution by the accurate information, the catholic sentiments, no less than the deep philanthropy which adorn the pages of this unpretending little treatise."—*Law Magazine.*

London: WILDY & SONS, Lincoln's-inn-archway.

SLACK'S FENDER AND FIRE-IRON WAREHOUSE is the MOST ECONOMICAL, consistent with good quality.—Iron Fenders, 3s. 6d.; Brouzed ditto, 8s. 6d., with standards; superior Drawing-room ditto, 14s. 6d. to 50s.; Fire Irons, 2s. 6d. to 20s. Patent Dish Covers, with handles to take off, 18s. set of six. Table Knives and Forks, 8s. per dozen. Roasting Jacks, complete, 7s. 6d. Tea-trays, 6s. 6d. set of three; elegant Papier Maché ditto, 25s. the set. Teapots, with plated knob, 5s. 6d.; Coal Scuttles, 2s. 6d. A set of Kitchen Utensils for cottage, £3. Slack's Cutlery has been celebrated for 50 years. Ivory Table Knives, 14s., 16s., and 18s. per dozen. White Bone Knives and Forks, 8s. 9d. and 12s.; Black Horn ditto, 8s. and 10s. All warranted.

As the limits of an advertisement will not allow of a detailed list, purchasers are requested to send for their Catalogue, with 350 drawings, and prices of Electro Plate, Warranted Table Cutlery, Furnishing Ironmongery, &c. May be had gratis or post free. Every article marked in plain figures at the same low prices for which their establishment has been celebrated for nearly 50 years. Orders above £2 delivered carriage free per rail.

RICHARD AND JOHN SLACK, 336, STRAND, LONDON,
Opposite Somerset House.

TO SOLICITORS, &c., requiring DEED BOXES, will find the best-made article lower than any other house. Lists of Prices and sizes may be had gratis or sent post free.

RICHARD and JOHN SLACK, 336, Strand, opposite Somerset House Established nearly 50 years. Orders above £2 sent carriage free.

ALBION SNELL, WATCHMAKER, JEWELLER, &c., 114, High Holborn, W.C. (seven doors east of King-st.) London. Every watch skilfully examined, timed, and its performance guaranteed.

Gold Watches, from	30gs. to 3gs.
Silver ditto, „	12gs. „ 30s.

Any article exchanged if not approved, and a written warranty given when desired.

A choice assortment of French Clocks always on hand.
Established in 1848.
Checks crossed Union Bank.
Post Office Orders payable at the Office, High Holborn